UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. VI SUMMER, 1954 No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Marian Year and Protestants

Ecumenism and Theology

DR. W.H. VAN DE POL

The Problem of Unity

W. DE VRIES, S.J.

The Separated East Under the Shadow of Moscow

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Important Appeal to German Lutherans

The Archbishop of Canterbury's views on Unity — And a Reply

Towards a Sound Ecumenical Movement — A Letter from Taizé

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S.J., Prefect of Studies and Dean of the Theological Faculty, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association*, and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor :

Rev. Fr. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.,
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary:

Rev. Fr. GERMANUS TOMAINO, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscription $2.00
Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand
London, W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. VI — SUMMER, 1954 — No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Marian Year and Protestants

Ecumenism and Theology

DR. W.H. VAN DE POL

The Problem of Unity

W. DE VRIES, S.J.

The Separated East Under the Shadow of Moscow

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Important Appeal to German Lutherans

The Archbishop of Canterbury's views on Unity — And a Reply

Towards a Sound Ecumenical Movement — A Letter from Taizé

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia
Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

June, 1954

THE MARIAN YEAR AND PROTESTANTS

Many Protestants find it difficult to understand the Marian Year and Catholic devotion towards the Blessed Virgin Mary in general. On the other hand, Catholics do not find it easy to understand this difficulty of Protestants. Here we have a particular point where opposite forces of thought and feeling meet and which demonstrates the reality of our divisions.

For a Catholic, to venerate, to love, and to honor as much as possible the creature who was privileged to be the Mother of God, and who appears in the Gospel so pure, so humble, so loving, and united so closely with the Saviour from the Manger to the Cross, seems only natural since it follows so obviously from faith in the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption. To believe moreover with complete assurance that the Blessed Virgin Mary shares in the affection of Jesus towards us, that she willingly accepted for us the sacrifice of her Son, and that as a result she is heard when she intercedes for us, this too is very easy for the Catholic, and it is this that inspires his devotion towards Mary, the mother of mankind as well as the Mother of God.

Protestants for the most part agree in giving Mary the title of Mother of God. When one accepts the divinity of Christ, he can hardly fail to admit that the Mother of Jesus is the mother of a divine person. It was to reaffirm that Jesus is God that the Council of Ephesus proclaimed that Mary is the Mother of God. The catechism which I studied as a child expressed this very clearly by saying: "Mary is the Mother of God, because she is the Mother of Jesus Christ, Who is God." What is it, then, that prevents Protestants from grasping the consequences that flow from this incomparable title?

Perhaps it is failure to reflect sufficiently on the matter. Saint Thomas has written: "The humanity of Christ, because it is united to God; created blessedness, because it is the enjoyment of God; and the Blessed Virgin Mary, because she is the Mother of God—these have a dignity that is in some way infinite because they come from the Infinite Good which is God; and with reference to them nothing can be made better since there is nothing better than God." (I, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4).

A dignity which is in some way infinite—where could it be found if not in this creature whom God Himself called: My Mother? The Protestant pastor Jean Bosc, writing recently in *Réforme* (Apr. 3, 1954), cites Luther on this point: "The only dignity of the Virgin Mary was that she permitted her own indignity to be submerged by the pure grace of God". If by this it is meant that all that Mary has she received through the grace of God, who would contest it? But what grace confers is well conferred, and when grace makes one the Mother of God it confers a dignity so eminent that the most genuine sanctity and the most radiant influence and the most powerful intercession flow from it naturally, just as rays emanate from the sun.

It is indeed true that if Mary was truly all-pure in herself and in the eyes of God, and above all if she enjoyed a rôle in the work of the

redemption of men, the fundamental theses of the Lutheran reform are weakened. When it is admitted, as it must be, that a human creature can be in this life without sin, can possess in herself a holiness that is truly the result of divine grace but is at the same time proper to her, can perform works pleasing to God and meritorious in His sight; it must also be admitted that it is reasonable and useful to see in this creature an intermediary with God. Along with veneration of the Virgin the veneration of the saints is made reasonable. All the riches of Catholic teaching and Catholic worship flow from this open gateway, and it is no longer possible to say: the Bible alone, faith alone.

But it would be interesting to know if there are still many Protestants who agree completely with Luther on justification, to the point that like him they would not admit any real change in the one justified, any real sanctity, any ability to perform meritorious acts. Many of those who claim to follow the lead of the Reformation seem to speak now of interior renovation, spiritual regeneration, and of actions to which is attached real merit in the order of salvation. These at least should not find any difficulty in recognizing in Mary, the Mother of God, a profound interior sanctity, a real co-operation in the divine plan. They should be capable of understanding the progress of Marian theology and see why two definitions have been sanctioned in the course of a century. These two definitions, of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and of her Assumption—what do they signify more than the inability of the Christian sense, based on Scripture and Tradition, to conceive in the case of the Virgin Mary corruption of any sort, either of soul or body? The divine Maternity excludes sin of any kind; and the humiliations of the tomb should not be able to affect the body in which was formed the body of Christ.

Those of Lutheran heritage, like those who read Karl Barth, speak also of another kind of difficulty: they fear that the Virgin may become, like a wall, an obstacle between God and themselves. But experience teaches just the opposite. Mary is a help on the way to God. It is impossible for a Catholic to address himself to the Virgin without feeling closer to God. An awareness, however vague, of the divinity, which is the source, the pattern, and the purpose of all the glories of Mary, accompanies always his contemplation of the Virgin. In particular the devotion to the Mother is imbued with devotion to the Son; it tends to strengthen and increase it. It is a fact that where devotion to Mary flourishes, love for the Saviour—adored in His crib, or on the Cross, or in the Eucharist—increases. One might think of Lourdes, for example. Pilgrimages to Our Lady's shrine there are marked by confession, by communion, by conversion to God. The Marian Year will bring new life to many souls. The Lutheran pastor Asmussen, I think, was the one who remarked: "Catholics, with their devotion to the Virgin, have a Christology that is more profound than that of Protestants who wish to venerate Christ alone".

And this is rightly so. For the perfection of Mary comes from

her contact with God; one cannot admire her and confide in her without this admiration and confidence ascending ultimately to God. Moreover, it is the great appreciation that one has of the divinity, and the great love that one has for Jesus Christ, that inspires and determines the veneration of the Virgin. In a word, the light that streams from Mary makes clear to the faithful the true order, and that she is, in her glory as Mother, the servant of the Lord. A non-Catholic clergyman once told me: "Father, we are discovering devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and it is truly enriching us." Would that all Protestants might enjoy that experience! Their prejudices on this point would vanish, and a great step towards reconciliation would be taken.

THE EDITOR

ECUMENISM AND THEOLOGY

The Ecumenical Movement in itself is neither a doctrine nor a quest of doctrine. It is rather a converging of activities which have a determined end in view and which have adopted means that are proportionate to that end. This of course implies a system of ideas, and since it unfolds itself on a religious plane, it presupposes a theology.

If all the Christians who belong to the World Council of Churches, or who at least are interested in the activities of this Council were to adopt the same end and were to tend towards it by the same means, unity would become an accomplished fact, and all those Christians would then possess the same theology. The movement continues, however, precisely because the existing theologies are diverse, and therefore there is evident need of reducing them to a consistent unity. According as one conceives of the nature of the Church, he envisions this or that particular unity, or he adopts this or that method of procedure.

The Catholic, who according to a happy distinction made by Dr. Zander (1), is interested in the Ecumenical Movement without entering its organization, is then constantly inspired by his Catholic theology. His thinking is shaped by its principles, and his non-Catholic brethren with whom he discusses matters are well aware of this position of Catholics. It is for this reason that it would seem useful for us to give a brief delineation of this doctrine which is at the same time a stimulus and an obstacle for the work of ecumenicity (2).

Every Catholic holds the following points: the Roman Catholic Church is the only Church founded by Christ; the unity that this Church possesses and which is that willed by Christ comprises unity of faith, unity of government, and unity of worship; the only way of repairing Christian unity is to summon all Christians back into this unity of the Church; this return is possible only by submission to the Catholic hierarchy and to its supreme head, the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the Pope. Not only must they receive that which they refused to accept at the time of their separation—for example, in the East, the *Filioque* (i.e., the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and also from the Son); and in the West, that the good works of the just merit Heaven—but even more is it necessary to hold as a doctrine of faith that which has since been defined as such by the Councils or by the Pope of Rome; and it will be necessary likewise to accept decisions of a tragic significance, such as that of the nullity of Anglican Orders. Here, indeed, is a block which seems to bar the way and which, moreover, no one has any power to remove. The Instruction of the Holy Office on the Ecumenical Movement (March 1951) requests that it not be concealed ("the whole and full Catholic doctrine

---

(1) *Vision and Action* by L. A. Zander, London: 1953 p. 42.

(2) On this point one may with profit consult *Catholic Ecumenism* by Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S.A., Washington, 1953.

is therefore to be set forth and explained"), and in fact the claims of the Catholic Church are perfectly well known to all the Christians not in communion with Rome.

Nevertheless, on both sides the hope of surmounting the present obstacles continues still. Even if a miracle should be necessary, we know that the power of God will not be lacking. From the point of view of Catholics, we are convinced that the transition from the points which are held in common to those which ought to be is a natural one, and even self-impelling. For the Church of Rome, it is accomplished according to the law of vital development; the same law can also be of assistance to others outside her fold. On the part of non-Catholics there is the hope that explanations can be given or that the modifications which are found difficult today will be easier tomorrow. In this way contact is maintained, and in fact a certain *rapprochement* is realized.

Non-Catholic Christians, who know that the Roman Church will always preserve solicitously that which she deems essential, have sometimes only a confused or inexact notion of what is essential; it is necessary to repeat to them, for instance, that the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and her Assumption into Heaven are to held by faith no less than the dogmas of the Trinity or of the Incarnation. Likewise, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, recourse to the intercession of the Saints, the veneration of relics are points which are just as essential to Catholic piety.

On the other hand, certain disciplines of the Catholic Church which are venerable and of long-standing, and quite beneficial even today, are sometimes regarded as essential and unalterable when they are not really so at all. The famous article in the London *Times* ("Catholicism Today", October 31, 1949) which touched off a lively discussion between Catholics and Protestants, contains this clause: "...the distinction between the essential and the inessential is not always easy to determine, and the number of 'essential' articles of belief is not perhaps as large as is commonly supposed". The idea in itself is a correct one except that the expression of it is quite inexact; everything that is an article of faith is essential.

We have in fact seen that recently the Pope permitted the ordination to the priesthood of two former Protestant ministers who were married men. Again, although Latin is the official and liturgical language of the Church of Rome, other liturgical languages are also held in high esteem by her. The liturgy of the Church assumes a diversity of form according to the Byzantine, Coptic, Maronite, Syro-Malabarese, and other rites which are all equally Catholic. The election of bishops, too, although always dependent on the Holy See, is carried out in different ways according to the Churches, or even according to concordats. The religious life, further, which is always characterized by the practice of the evangelical counsels, takes on the most diverse forms; so much so, that the way of life of certain monks on Mount Athos or in Russia,

which often appears strange to the Western mind, could enter the Catholic pattern without any difficulty (3).

One difference that is often wrongly presented as essential but which is, nevertheless, important, is that of the two mentalities of the East and West. Temperament, culture, tradition have in actual fact fashioned in a different manner the man of the East on the one hand, with his contemplative and idealistic bent; and on the other, the man of the West with his active and practical outlook on life. It is probable, however, that with the increasing frequency of contact the differences will diminish. Be that as it may, they can remain and be expressed in the religious life, and especially in the liturgy and worship, without impairing and even without weakening the unity willed by Christ. Uniformity is not, in fact, what Our Lord desired, but rather the harmony of minds and hearts in the same faith and in the same adoration; an agreement supposes diversity. A reflection of this truth may be seen from the fact that at Rome a special Congregation exists whose chief concern is to look after the affairs of the Eastern Churches.

Dr. Zander, in agreement with Chomiakov on this point, insists upon the opposition of East and West (4). He believes it deeper, or at least more radical, than the diversities which exist in the make-up of the West as well as in that of the East. He is doubtlessly right if he means to refer to differences in temperament and activity. But when it is a question of religion or of what is essential to religion, East and West can without any real difficulty be in communion with each other in the same faith and in the same worship. The diversities which will remain and which can retain their colorful and impressive appearance in the liturgy are of an accidental order; they will serve to give even more brilliancy to the essential agreement. Viewing things as they are at the present time, the gap which exists between Catholics and Protestants is a good deal larger than that which separates us from our fellow Christians in the East.

The distinction between what is essential and what is accidental, as well as the necessity of agreeing on the essentials in order to be called truly united, are constantly suggesting themselves to whoever is engaged in any way in the Ecumenical Movement. But very often it is precisely on essential points that difference is felt. The Orthodox made a formal declaration of this in various conferences, especially at Lausanne in 1927 and at Lund in 1952. At other times no understanding is reached on the basic or accidental character of the same point. Thus, certain Anglicans do not believe that they differ from Catholics on anything essential and refuse to admit the nullity of Anglican Orders proclaimed by Pope Leo XIII. They view it instead as a provisional decision and only as being disciplinary in its nature, whereas Catholics accept it as a dogmatic and definitive statement.

---

(3) *La Sainteté en Russie* by P. I. Kologrivof: Paris, 1953.

(4) *Vision and Action*, p. 61.

In recent years there has fortunately been a good deal of emphasis placed upon non-theological factors as causes of division among Christians (5). It is undeniable that political considerations, or nationalistic sentiments, or historical background, or even certain habits of thought and feeling have often aggravated doctrinal conflicts, have caused them to become unduly extended, and have further conserved the potency of division in them. Doctrine, however, does not on that account cease to remain the principal thing. Other factors may indeed enlarge the cleft of separation; but it is doctrinal difference which has brought it about. Certainly, this divergence could often be reduced to some general principle which, once admitted, carries along with it any subordinate oppositions. Thus, the entire schism of the East ultimately rests on the refusal to recognize the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome; all of Protestantism derives from the principle of individual freedom. Indeed, if one were to effect this reduction, he would find himself confronted by the essence of the problem; it will be found that it is to this unique principle, upon which all depends, that the Orthodox and the Protestants adhere.

It will be necessary, then, if we wish to arrive at any important results, to concern ourselves with doctrine. Consequently, Catholics have always sympathetically regarded the Faith and Order movement which today has become a Commission of the World Council of Churches. This organization has endeavored to study the field of doctrine in order to advance towards unity of faith. The documents which it published in preparation for the Conference of Lund are quite remarkable in themselves for their clear and logical presentation and give rise to the hope of future progress (6).

Nothing in our day could be better than the insistence upon the exercise of mutual charity, the forgetfulness of the wrongs of the past, and regret for those which are our own. In this way, existing obstacles are removed, and minds are opened to the light which should come to them; but it will be necessary that the light come. By the same token, no one can pray too much for the inestimable benefit of Christian unity; this prayer, however, should intend the doctrinal progress of those Christians who find themselves separated from us.

The atmosphere created by the Ecumenical Movement permits the exposition of doctrine under more favorable conditions. One can expect now to be read or heard with a good measure of sympathy and good will. Moreover, the doctrine of the Church will be set forth without accommodation or mitigation. The more that truth is shown in its purity, the more persuasive it will become. Man's intelligence has been made for light, and under the action of grace it becomes eager for supernatural enlightenment. Besides, one will find among our non-Catholic

---

(5) Cf., for example, one of the preparatory reports for the Conference of Lund: *The Church in the Purpose of God* by the Rev. O. S. Tomkins, p. 79 ff.

(6) Cf. the articles on Lund in *Unitas:* Vol. IV, nos. 1, 2, 4; Vol. V, 2.

brethren some points of departure which permit them to advance in our direction. In the case of Protestantism, the Bible faithfully interpreted will lead one logically to acknowledge an infallible authority in the Church. In this connection, Dr. Oscar Cullman, a French Lutheran, admits the fact that Jesus established Peter as the head of His Church; one step more, and he will see this head must have had a successor. If we are dealing with the Churches of the East, the history of the first eleven centuries shows that Rome intervened in the different controversies and that the Councils acclaimed the word of Peter in the mouth of Innocent I, Leo the Great, and Agatho. The doctrines that were to be defined later were already being lived and sometimes even formulated under the most adverse circumstances.

Let us work, then, for the great accomplishment of Christian unity with all our strength and with all the resources of our charity; but let us at the same time remember that the foundation of this unity can only be a common faith.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

THE PROBLEM OF UNITY

From the point of view of the Christian Faith, it seems to be an anomaly and to be altogether inconceivable that Christians among themselves should be faced with a problem of unity. And yet this is an internal problem about which Christians have different views and on the solution of which they find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to reach a satisfactory agreement.

This fact seems to be in flat contradiction with the essential meaning of the Christian Message and the work Christ came to accomplish on earth.

As we well know, sin means enmity between man and God; and in consequence of this, it also means enmity between man and man. Sin means separation, antagonism, revolution, strife, war, dispersion, disintegration, and to all intents and purposes always the exact opposition to unity and communion.

The Christian Message, however, is a message of peace, peace with God and peace with one another. The work of Christ was meant to be pre-eminently a work of reconciliation, restoration, unification, reintegration. In one of his Epistles St. Paul puts it in this way, saying that it has been the will and purpose of God, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might re-establish all things in Christ, both those which are in heaven, and those which are on earth." (Eph. I, 10).

In Christ, God has been reconciling man to Himself. But no less, God has also been reconciling all believers one to another by incorporating them into the one and indivisible Body of Christ, by making them members of the Body of Christ, "which is the Church", and hence by making them members one of another.

This unity in Christ is understood to be a real ontological (not only a symbolical or figurative) unity, so real that it almost sounds materialistic. For Paul goes on by saying: "For no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the Church: for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. V, 29). Such is the unity which Christians are said to have one with another. It is a unity and communion which is not the result of organisation, not a natural form of union and co-operation; rather is it understood by Holy Scripture to be a unity, communion, fellowship, and co-operation which have a supernatural source and foundation, a unity which is brought about and kept into being by no less than the power and influence of the Holy Spirit, which is the bond of love between God and the Eternal Son, the bond of love also between Christ and the Church, which is called the Mystical Body of Christ.

Now supposing this to be not a fancy, an ideal, a project, but a reality here and now, how then can there be any room among Christians for disunion, schism, and almost complete separation? And yet Chris-

tians are faced with the fact of their divisions and the problem of how to restore their lost unity.

I think that the problem of Christian Unity, i.e., the problem of how to restore a complete and real unity between all Christians all over the world, a unity which outwardly, openly, and evidently manifests itself before the world, is the most difficult problem Christians have ever been called upon to solve among themselves.

The solution of the problem is extremely difficult for many reasons.

First of all, Christians of the various parts of Christendom have different views as to the causes of the Christian divisions. Then there are different views among Christians as to the essence and form of Christian Unity. Thirdly, it stands to reason that the differences just mentioned must necessarily result in contrasting views as to the methods by which unity has to be restored. The difficulties seem to be so immense and a complete visible and outward reunion of all Christians seems to be so remote, if not fully unattainable, that many look upon ecumenical ideals and projects as unreal, Utopian, and without any prospect of realisation. And such they would be indeed, if God, if Christ, if the Holy Spirit, and the Church were not living realities; if we, human beings, were left completely to ourselves in our attempts at promoting Christian Unity. Therefore, everything depends upon whether the Christian Faith is based upon God and God's revelation, or whether the Christian Faith is an empty dream. To all Christians, be they Catholics or Protestants, who have a living and strong faith in God, in Christ, and in the power of the Holy Spirit, all things seem to be possible when they are in accordance with the will and purpose of God.

Now undoubtedly it is one of the most striking and one of the most hopeful facts of this century that Christians of all Churches and denominations have come to the conclusion that the present state of a divided Christendom is a shame and a sin and that the restoration among Christians of the unity they have lost is certainly according to the will and purpose of God as it has been revealed in Christ. What are called ecumenical views, projects, ideals, and actions must be considered as being based upon an act of faith, faith in Christ, and faith in the power of his Word and Spirit, the ultimate result as yet being left to God's purpose, guidance, and providence.

It is not possible to understand the Ecumenical Movement nor to partake in it in any real or practical way unless one looks upon this movement and its prospects from the point of view of God's revelation and the Christian act of faith, hope, and love. We must not judge ecumenical ideals, discussions, and operations from a merely human and natural point of view. For then indeed they would seem to be fully without any prospect of realisation or success.

And so we must take the ecumenical ideals, views, and attempts of this 20th century as a fact of history. It is one of the most important facts of the ecclesiastical history (or the history of Christendom) of

this century that on a very wide scale and among Christians of all sorts of Churches and communions ecumenical ideas and ideals have been awakening and after a period of vagueness and uncertainty have gradually been taking more definite and substantial forms. One of the most striking examples of this has been the actual formation and institution of the World Council of Churches with its centre in Geneva. In this World Council of Churches more than 150 Christian Churches and denominations are officially represented as members, together embracing a total number of about 300 million Christians.

We cannot enter now into questions concerning the historical causes of the divisions among Christians. So much will have to be said and the barriers on the road towards unity are many and manifold. It is a well-known fact that the Roman Catholic Church finds it impossible to join the World Council as an official member. Many grievances, prejudices, and misunderstandings between Catholics and Protestants stand in the way to closer relations. There have already been ecumenical contacts and discussions between Roman Catholics and Protestants in some countries like Germany, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Up to the present, they have already failed to reach such measure of mutual understanding as might have been expected. This is mainly due to the exclusiveness of the Roman Catholic view on the nature and scope of the Church and on the other hand to the fact that Protestants find it difficult to study the ecclesiological problem with a really serene and unprejudiced mind.

Suppose, however, that one day all these obstacles were removed; even in this case the actual differences between Catholics and Protestants as to their interpretation of the Christian message and the Christian Faith would still be there.

Here lies the crucial point. Ultimately the ecumenical problem is not a problem of "Life and Work"; it is not a question of how Christians can be brought to work together for the common good of mankind. As a matter of fact, there is no reason whatsoever why Catholics and Protestants should not do so on a large scale. The real issue, however, lies somewhere else. Ultimately the ecumenical problem is a problem of "Faith and Order". The question is how Christians can be brought to an unanimous confession of the Faith as it has been revealed and how they can be brought to reunite in the One Church which is the Mystical Body of Christ on earth.

In other words: the ecumenical problem is the problem of the nature and meaning of the Church and its Unity. Elsewhere I have already touched on some of the differences between the Catholic and the Protestant interpretations of the Christian Faith. (1) There are differences of view as to the meaning and character of original sin, of human nature, of supernatural grace. All such differences, however, seem to

(1) *The Christian Dilemma* by W.H. Van de Pol, D.D., London: 1952.

lead to and to culminate in one cardinal difference regarding the nature and meaning of the Church and her sacramental (supernatural, mystical) life of grace.

The problem of unity is fundamentally an ecclesiological (ecclesia = church) problem. The answer to this problem depends on the answer to the question: what is the nature of the Church? Christians will never be able to solve the ecumenical problem unless and until they reach a complete agreement as to their view of the nature of the Church.

It is a fact that the whole body of all Christians is not a visible unity, that the body of Christians is split up into a great number of denominations, some of which call themselves Churches, or even the Church, while others prefer to call themselves a Brotherhood, a Society, or even an Army (Salvation Army). Some Churches lay great stress on the fact of the visible Church having been instituted by Christ himself, while others deny that this is a fact.

Nearly all Christians admit that the Christian Faith implies belief in One Holy Catholic Church, a Church of God to which all men who have ever believed in God, or will believe in God, belong. This Church, however, many of them say, is solely a matter of faith, not a matter of sight. Although the Church of God does manifest itself in this world in many different ways, still there is no visible expression or manifestation on earth which could completely and unreservedly be identified with the Church or Family of God, which is an object of faith. All Christians —they would say—believe that there is One Holy Church, but no particular Church on earth can be identified with *the* Church, because there is in fact a great number of Churches. Each of these Churches has an identity of its own. Each of these Churches confesses the Christian Faith according to its best ability and at all events according to its own interpretation and conviction. Each of these Churches has a way of worship, a spiritual life, and a form of Church-order of its own, according to its own particular views. All Churches or denominations have their own limitations, weaknesses, and imperfections, or even errors. All Churches are but very human and therefore very imperfect manifestations of *the* Church, of the One Holy Catholic Church.

It would be a deplorably unchristian token of pride and self-conceit if any out of the many Christian denominations should consider itself to be the One Church of God or the One Church of Christ with complete exclusion of all other Churches and denominations. This is why the World Council of Churches has been inviting all Christian Churches and denominations to become members of the World Council, in order that the Churches might learn to see their own limitations, to understand one another, and to work together for a closer unity and co-operation.

It has never been the aim or intention of the World Council of Churches to become itself the One Church and to replace the many Churches which have joined the Council of Churches. The sole intention has always been to bring the Churches and denominations together,

in order to discuss the actual state of affairs and to see what could be done to promote closer unity and co-operation.

Yet the diversity of standpoints among the Member Churches of the World Council has already been the cause of many difficulties. One of the difficulties is that of the relationship between the Church (the One Church of the Creeds), the Churches, and the World Council of Churches.

The Central Committee of the World Council at its meeting in Toronto in July 1950 received a statement which it commended for study and comment to the Churches. The last chapter of this statement deals with "the assumptions underlying the World Council of Churches". In this chapter the 4th paragraph says: "The member Churches of the World Council consider the relationship of other Churches to the Holy Catholic Church which the Creeds profess as a subject for mutual consideration. Nevertheless, membership does not imply that each Church must regard the other member Churches as Churches in the true and full sense of the word".

I think it is largely in answer to this question of the relationship between the Church and the Churches that at the meeting of the conference on "Faith and Order" in Lund in August 1952, Athenagoras of Thyateira in his capacity as official representative of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople read a statement in which it was explicitly declared that "the Greek Orthodox Church knows and proclaims, that she is the whole and only Church, the Body of Christ, the only mandatory agent of the Apostles. So she only can definite the Faith. And we are sure that this is a proof of her uniqueness".

The tragedy is that this is the same claim which is made by the Roman Catholic Church, only with this difference that she has never joined the World Council of Churches as an official member.

The problem of unity, i.e. the problem of the relationship between the One Holy Catholic Church of the Creeds and the actual denominations that exist in the world is a very intricate problem. There are mainly five different standpoints among Christians in connection with this subject: the Roman Catholic, the Greek Orthodox, the Anglican, the Reformed-Protestant (Lutheran and Calvinistic) and the Sectarian standpoint. We shall attempt a presentation of these varying points of view in a subsequent article.

Dr. W. H. VAN DE POL

THE SEPARATED EAST UNDER THE SHADOW OF MOSCOW

Nine centuries have already gone by since that unhappy day—16th July 1054—when the papal legate, Cardinal Umberto da Silva Candida, laid the bull of excommunication against the patriarch Michael Cerularius on the altar of Hagia Sophia at Constantinople. That unfortunate event is generally considered, rightly or wrongly, as the moment when the Byzantine schism began.

A review of the present situation of the separated Byzantine Churches can give us an appreciation of the consequences of their separation from the one, true Church of Christ which, according to the will of God, has its center in Rome. The title of this article—"The Separated East under the Shadow of Moscow"—gives in a few words the actual state of affairs. The great majority of the separated Churches, first of all the Russian Patriarchate, is today, unfortunately, no more than an instrument of an atheistic government whose very purpose is the stamping out of all religion.

For the moment this power finds it expedient to allow the Orthodox Church to continue to exist, and to use it as a means of propaganda in its own interests. The intention of the Russian despots is that the Patriarchate of Moscow, which lies immediately at the mercy of the center of control of atheistic Communism, should assume an effective leadership of the other Churches and so make them submissive towards the godless State. Where the Communist influence is in control, this plan has already largely succeeded. But even outside this sphere Moscow (and we shall see with what success) stretches out its tentacles and endeavours to gain adherents in the so-called free world.

Six years ago, in another article, the author discussed practically the same theme under the title: "Moscow, the Third Rome" (1), and showed how Moscow today renews the ancient claim of exercising authority over the whole of Christendom in succession to the "First Rome," which fell into heresy, and the "second", Constantinople, conquered by the infidels. This policy of the Russian Patriarchate reached its culminating point in the almost panorthodox council which met in Moscow in July, 1948. Under the leadership of the Patriarch of Moscow, a certain unification of the Churches on the other side of the Iron Curtain was effected, and he was given the power to introduce any necessary reforms in all the Orthodox Churches. However, since that year a certain change is noticeable in the tactics of Moscow, even though the end to be obtained remains the same, namely, the hegemony of the entire Orthodox world. Recently there

---

(1) "Mosca, la 'Terza Roma' oggi", in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 15, V, and 19 VI, 1948.

has been no more open talk of "Moscow, the Third Rome." (2) Attempts are being made to camouflage the tendency to dominate the other Orthodox Churches; in fact, express denials are issued that the tendency exists at all.

In the spring of 1948 the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi had made a declaration of the kind to the correspondent of TASS: "The Patriarch Alexis has no intention of exercising any control over the Orthodox Churches nor of usurping the place of the Ecumenical Patriarch" (EPS March 5, 1948). In the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow* for January 1949, in an article on the solemn opening of a Russian church in the capital of Roumania, one reads how "the opening of this church is intended as a step towards the creation of real unity between the sister Orthodox Churches of Roumania, Bulgaria, Russia . . . on the basis of equal authority and without any attempt to establish the primacy of one sister Church over the other" (J. P. M. p. 6).

There is need, therefore, to be very cautious in the face of the report put out recently by the review of the Russian anti-Soviet emigrés, *Pravoslavnaja Rusj (Orthodox Russia),* published in New York, that the Patriarch Alexis had the intention of convening a panorthodox council in Moscow to obtain for himself official recognition of the prerogatives of the Ecumenical Patriarch (See *Pravoslavnaja Rusj,* 28-1-1954 p. 1). In the January number of the Moscow review mentioned above, the fact that the date of an eventual ecumenical council is quite uncertain is mentioned as something which everybody is aware of (J.P.M. 1954 n. 1, p. 70).

The reason why Moscow does not at the moment openly assert its primacy over the entire Orthodox Church would seem to derive from its present polemics against Constantinople, which recently loudly insisted on its own claims to pre-eminence in the Orthodox world. The reigning Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras, in an encyclical dated February 26, 1950, and addressed to the "Universal Orthodox Church," recalled the attention of all to the viewpoint of Constantinople that "local Orthodox churches solely through communion and contact with the Ecumenical Patriarchate belong to the body of the universal Orthodox Church," and "the Mother Church of Constantinople has the right to expect from her daughters loyal obedience and the exact and spontaneous discharge of their duties towards her" (*Orthodoxia,* Feb. 1950, p. 39 ff.).

The Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi criticized this encyclical in an interview which he gave to a Bulgarian journalist. It was, he said, no more than a repetition of the old attempt of Constantinople to

(2) It is true that N. Muraviev in a recent article in the Moscow review reverts to the idea of the "Third Rome" but without applying it to the present era (*Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow* (JPM) 1953, n. 9, p. 51 ff: "The Fall of Constantinople and the Russian Church in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries").

transform its primacy of honour into one of jurisdiction which implied the intention of introducing the ideas of papistry into the Orthodox Church, a move which the Russian Church had always resisted (J. P. M. 1950, n. 7, p. 5).

In 1953 the August number of the same review contained an article by a certain A. Vedernikov on the question of a possible pro-synod, and Constantinople is attacked for its 'papistical' leanings. Ancient Rome fell away from the unity of the Church on account of her insatiable desire to lord it over the local churches. Constantinople seemed about to commit exactly the same error (J.P.M., 1953, n. 8, p. 47). If Moscow attacks Constantinople in these terms, clearly she herself cannot openly claim pre-eminence over all local churches as the "Third Rome." However, we cannot draw the conclusion from that that Moscow has really renounced her desire to dominate the universal Church, but that at the moment she is intent on encouraging a closer union among local Orthodox churches.

In his address on the occasion of the first anniversary of the enthronement of the Patriarch Alexis, the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi gave a clear enough exposition of the methods that must be used to achieve this, and cited the invitations sent by Moscow to representatives of other Churches, the visits of Russian ecclesiastical dignitaries to other countries, and the interchange of correspondence. Also after the Synod of July 1948 these methods continued to be put into operation. The patriarchate review gives a series of examples of the exchange of correspondence which we shall consider later. First we would like to give a short list, based on the report given in the *Journal,* of the visits of Moscow dignitaries to other Churches and the invitations Moscow has sent to them. This will give some idea of the intensity of the reciprocation.

* * * *

In November 1948 representatives of the Russian Church were present at the inauguration of the Russian church in Bucharest (J.P.M., 1949 n. 1, p. 6). In the same month the members of the "Russian Ecclesiastical Mission to the Holy Land" left for Jerusalem (J.P.M., 1949. n. 3, p. 8). In April 1949 Nicholas of Krutitsi, as a member of the "World Council for Peace", leaves for the Peace Congress in Paris (J.P.M., 1949, n. 6, p. 4). The propaganda campaign for peace is constantly being used to hide what is in fact a Communist move undertaken by the Orthodox Church. In January 1950 the "Russian Ecclesiastical Mission to the Holy Land" en route for Jerusalem pays a visit to Warsaw also (J.P.M., 1950, n. 4, p. 29). In the following month the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi consecrated new bishops in Czechoslovakia (J.P.M., 1950, n. 3, p. 7; n. 4, p. 10 ff.). In the months of June and July of the same year the same Metropolitan assisted at the Peace Congress of all religious denominations of Czechoslovakia (J.P.M., 1950, n. 7, p. 13). Towards the end of June the Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad left for Damascus as head of an ecclesiastical delegation to visit the Orthodox

Patriarch of Antioch; his journey brought him through Rome where he visited St. Peter's and other churches. In his report on this journey he censures the lack of devotion shown by tourists in these churches and the very small number of faithful who pray there—a rather unlikely story for the Holy Year (J.P.M., 1950, n. 9, pp. 43-44). In August the Patriarch Alexis meets personally with the Patriarchs of Georgia and Armenia at Tiflis and Etsmiadzin to work out a joint policy for the Peace Campaign (J.P.M., 1950, n. 8, pp. 5 ff.). In February 1951 Nicholas of Krutitsi addressed the Peace Congress in Berlin and in the following November a similar congress in Vienna (J.P.M., 1951, n. 3, p. 15; n. 11, p. 28 ff.). In July 1951 a Russian delegation under the Metropolitan John of Kiev was present at Warsaw for the enthronement of the new Metropolitan Macarius (J.P.M., 1951, n. 8, p. 43). In the same year, in December, Nicholas led a delegation to Czechoslovakia for the celebration of the autonomy of the Orthodox Church of that country (J.P.M., 1952, n. 1, p. 41 ff.). In March 1952 a delegation went to Finland (J.P.M., 1952, n. 7, p. 6 ff.). In May and June, Nicholas of Krutitsi accepted the invitation of the Bulgarian Metropolitan Cyril of Plovdiv to visit him (J.P.M. 1952, n. 7, p. 32 ff.); then went on to the Peace Congress in Berlin in July (J.P.M., 1952, n. 8, p. 21 ff.) and to that of Vienna in the following December (J.P.M., 1953, n. 1, p. 23). In October 1952 the Patriarch himself travelled to Tiflis (J.P.M., 1952, n. 12, p. 12). In May 1953 a Russian delegation assisted at the enthronement of the new Bulgarian patriarch in Sofia (J.P.M., 1953, n. 7, p. 16). In the following month we find Nicholas once more at the Peace Congress in Budapest (J.P.M., 1953, n. 7, p. 13). In August he is likewise in Finland (J.P.M., 1953, n. 8, p. 3 p. 10 sqq.), and mention is made of this visit by the paper *Isvestia* (18/3/1953). In November 1953 he assisted at a further peace congress in Vienna (J.P.M., 1954, n. 1, p. 34).

It is curious to note that the Patriarch himself, who in the first years after the war made many visits abroad, has not left the Soviet Union once since 1947. The Russian prelate who now does most travelling is the Metropolitan Nicholas, head of the Foreign Affairs department of that Church. But no one has ever gone to Yugoslavia as a consequence of the anti-Soviet policy of Tito, nor to Constantinople, nor Greece which has little love for the Russians, as we shall see.

* * * *

Now that we have considered the foreign travels of the Russian hierarchs, let us now see which foreign prelates paid visits to Moscow.

No further inter-Orthodox congress comparable in importance to that of July 1948 has since been convened. In July 1951 the Patriarchs of Antioch and Roumania attended an inter-Orthodox peace congress at Moscow, as well as the head of the Bulgarian Church, the Metropolitan Cyril of Plovdiv (J.P.M., 1951, n. 8, p. 8 ff.). The same foreign Churches were again represented at the peace congress for all religious denominations of the Soviet Union at Zagorsk near Moscow in 1952 (May). The Patriarchs of Georgia and of Armenia (the latter a Monophysite) resident in Soviet territory came in person (J.P.M., 1952, n. 6, p. 10 ff.).

Some Churches like the Patriarchate of Antioch (since the summer of 1948) and the Bulgarian Church (since May 1950) have permanent representatives in Moscow and possess their own church there (J.PM.., 1949, n. 3, p. 9; 1950, n. 5, p. 17).

On two occasions Roumanian and Polish delegations have been present, and once representatives of the following countries: Albania, China, Czechoslovakia, and Syria. Besides attendance at the congresses held in Moscow, other visits were made by foreign missions after the Synod in July 1948. In this context it should be noted that no representative of the Serb or Greek Church has ever been seen in Moscow since 1948. This list of the visits of Moscow dignitaries to places abroad and corresponding visits to Moscow on the part of foreign missions gives a clear idea of the intensely active foreign policy of the Russian Patriarchate.

It is, therefore, our intention to examine in detail the limits of its influence and the degree of control it exercises over the local Churches. A distinction must be made between the areas under direct Communist control and those of the free world. Behind the Iron Curtain, the Churches of Georgia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia come directly under the domination of Moscow, while those of Bulgaria, Roumania, and Albania are subject to close supervision.

Churches Behind the Iron Curtain

The Georgian Church, situated in territory which forms part of the Soviet Union, is naturally controlled from Moscow and is obliged to take an active share in the Communist peace campaign. On August 5th, 1950, the Georgian Patriarch Kallistratos signed, along with Alexis of Moscow and the Armenian Katholikos, an appeal for peace (J.P.M., 1950, n. 8, p. 5 ff.). In July 1951 he attended the inter-Orthodox peace congress at Moscow (J.P.M., 1951, n. 8, p. 8 ff.). Melchisedech, his successor, took part in the further peace congress at Zagorsk, not far from Moscow, in May 1952 (J.P.M., 1952, n. 6, p. 5 ff.). Russian delegates were present at his election which took place by acclamation in April 1952, a fact which suggests that the Russian representatives had taken care to ensure this unanimity.

The Ecumenical Patriarch had conceded the Orthodox Church of Poland its autonomy in 1924 at a time when Russia was contending with its own problems and difficulties; but the validity of this concession was contested by Moscow after this last war, and the Metropolitan Denis of Warsaw was forced to resign and the Polish Church to "restore normal relations with the Mother church." The democratic Polish government, according to the report in the Moscow *Journal*, guarantees full religious liberty and, in its endeavours to aid the recovery and re-establishment of normal life within the Orthodox Church, approved the despatch of a delegation to Moscow which left by air for the capital city on June 17th, 1948, under the leadership of the Archbishop of Bialistock Timothy (Sträter).

The delegation submitted a petition to the Patriarch Alexis for the

readmission of the Polish Church to canonical communion with the Mother Church of Moscow, asking at the same time for his blessing on its own autocephaly (J.P.M., 1948, n. 7, p. 16 ff.). The real value of the autocephaly conceded to it by Moscow can be gauged from the fact that Moscow gave the Polish Orthodox Church a Russian metropolitan, Macarius by name. Humbly confessing that it had no suitable candidate for this office, the Holy Synod of the Polish Church approached the "sister church" of Moscow for help. In June 1951 a special mission under Archbishop Timothy was sent to Moscow with the petition that the Patriarch should nominate a Russian bishop as metropolitan of Poland. The new metropolitan, Macarius, was solemnly enthroned in Warsaw on July 8th in the presence of a Russian delegation.

The small Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia made its formal submission to Moscow in 1946. The Patriarch himself nominated a Russian bishop, Eleutherius by name, as Metropolitan of Prague, and in February 1950 the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi consecrated another Russian, Alexis, as Bishop of Preskov. On November 23rd, 1951, the Russian Church granted autocephaly to that of Czechoslovakia, but the Russian Metropolitan, Eleutherius, and the Russian Alexis remained nevertheless in office: in fact, recently, the non-Russian bishops, Tsèstmir and Alexander (the latter an apostate), were deposed. The government of the Church therefore remained exclusively in the hands of the Russians. One auxiliary bishop only, consecrated not long ago, is Slovene (Methodius Millyi of Trebishov—cfr. J.P.M., 1953, n. 10, p. 21). Every year the Metroplitan Eleutherius makes his *ad limina* visit to the Patriarch of Moscow. The practical value therefore of the autocephaly can be accurately estimated.

The insignificant Orthodox Church of Hungary, with only about 50,000 adherents, came under direct control from Moscow after the last war. In October 1947, the Patriarch Alexis nominated as its administrator the Archpriest, John Variù, who had first gone to Moscow, putting him provisionally under the authority of his exarch in Vienna. The Hungarian Church won a certain autonomy from Moscow in 1949 but, with the nomination of the Archpriest John Kopolovits as administrator of the Orthodox parishes in Hungary, these latter are always considered as under the jurisdiction of Moscow (cfr. J.P.M., 1951, n. 10, p. 29). In point of fact the Metropolitan Eleutherius of Prague always comes to ordain candidates for the priesthood, as, for example, happened in November 1950. In August 1951 the Patriarch of Moscow gave orders that courses for Orthodox priests should be held in Budapest: the state office for ecclesiastical affairs offered its valuable assistance (cfr. J.P.M., 1951, n. 10, p. 29), so one may well imagine the nature of the courses given.

The Serb bishop, George Zubkovich, with still about 3,000 Orthodox under his authority, died on April 11th, 1951, and has had no successor.

* * * *

The Churches we have so far discussed—those of Georgia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary—come within the orbit of direct control

from Moscow. The Churches of Bulgaria, Roumania, and Albania form a second circle which pivots on Moscow and is closely allied with the Russian Patriarchate.

We will discuss first the Bulgarian Church. It was the Russian Patriarch who, at the request of the Bulgarian Synod, negotiated the healing of the schism with Constantinople in 1945. It was also the Russian Patriarchate which in 1953 intervened successfully in the person of the Metropolitan Nicholas and obtained the consent of the Bulgarian Government to the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate which had been suppressed in 1393. The Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad headed a Russian delegation at the patriarchal elections on May 10th, 1953. The *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow* acclaimed loudly the reestablishment of the patriarchate (J.P.M., 1953, n. 6, p. 38 ff.), and the Patriarch Alexis sent a letter of congratulation in the most cordial terms to the newly elected Patriarch, Cyril (J.P.M., 1953, n. 5, p. 9). This, of course, means that the new Patriarch fully satisfies the ideas of Moscow; in fact he is known as being a good Communist; is one of the vice-presidents of the "National Council for Peace of Bulgaria": was the Bulgarian delegate at the Peace-Congress in Vienna in 1952, and as Metropolitan of Plovdiv and delegate of the President of the Holy Synod, organised a solemn reception in honour of Stalin on the occasion of his birthday, lauding him as the great Master and Leader of Progressive Peoples (cfr. *Zrkoven Vestnik*, 1/1/1952, p. 8 ff.).

There has been no lack of devotion on the part of the Bulgarian Church towards the Russian, nor of loyalty towards the Communist regime, and the proof of this is clear enough from a single example. In June 1950 on the occasion of a Bulgarian ecclesiastical congress in Sofia, a telegram was sent to the Russian Patriarch expressing full agreement with his 'peace appeal' and containing sentiments of filial devotion towards the head of the Russian Church. The promise was reaffirmed of faithfully labouring in the cause of peace under the guidance of Soviet Russia (J.P.M., 1950, n. 6, p. 4). As we have already noted, the Bulgarian Church took part in the Peace Congress at Moscow in July 1951 and at Zagorsk in May 1952. At the first congress it was represented by its own metropolitan, Cyril of Plovdiv. When the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi attained his sixtieth birthday in the spring of 1951, he was made an honorary Doctor by the Ecclesiastical Academy of Sofia (J.P.M., 1952, n. 4, p. 8 ff.) and invited by Cyril to receive the honour in person in Bulgaria (J.P.M., 1952, n. 7, p. 32 ff.). The lessons of the Theological Institute of Sophia must be given in a "progressive spirit" (as in Russia), and Marxist Philosophy is a compulsory subject.

Similar close relations prevail between the Russian Patriarchate and the Roumanian Church. The Communist affiliations of the Patriarch Justinian, at the moment reorganizing his Church according to the Soviet plan, are well-known. After 1948 he paid two visits to Moscow, the first in May 1950 (J.P.M., 1950, n. 7, p. 20 ff.) and the second for the peace congress in July 1951. It was on this latter occasion that he

gave his signature to the 'peace appeal' addressed to all the Christians of the world, in which document America was stigmatized as the aggresser in the Korean conflict (J.P.M., 1951, n. 8, p. 3 ff.). His actual words at Moscow were these: "We help our Government in every way possible because we are convinced that the socialist system has no other end in view except the happiness of the workers" (cfr. *Irénikon* 1952, n. 3, p. 288). A further proof of his attitude towards Moscow was given in May 1953 when he went in person to Sofia to attend the enthronement of the Bulgarian Patriarch. In a pastoral letter dated Christmas 1952 he writes as an advocate of Communist peace propaganda to the extent of comparing America to Herod.

Along with the Patriarch's personal propaganda for peace must be included the pastoral letter of the Holy Synod, dated Feb. 26, 1950, addressed to the clergy and faithful and all Christians of the People's Republic of Roumania. This letter attacks the rich of England and America as enemies of peace, while the Soviet Union is hailed as being in the vanguard of the friends of peace (J.P.M., 1950, n. 4, p. 38). This pastoral letter was ordered to be read from all the pulpits of the Orthodox churches. One section of the clergy shares the pro-Communist attitude of the Patriarch; in fact, in the Summer of 1950, 250 priests undertook to preach in a 'democratic' spirit and add to their sermons a short political commentary, giving to Communist emblems a place of honour in the church (*Herder-Korrespondenz,* Nov. 1951, p. 29). However, some Orthodox bishops have had to resign on account of their resistance to Communism, and not a few priests were punished for the same reason. There is no doubt that the official direction of the Orthodox Roumanian Church is within the orbit of Moscow.

The Roumanian Church gives its support to the Russian Patriarchate in its campaign against Constantinople. The theological review, *Orthodoxia,* published a special number of the jubilee of the Council of Chalcedon in which Constantinople's interpretation of Canon 28 came in for heavy criticism (cfr. *Irénikon* 1952, n. 1, p. 70). A logical consequence of this policy is that teaching in the theological academies must be inspired by the 'progressive spirit'.

Finally, the Orthodox Church of Albania, since the election of the Metropolitan Paisij in August 1949, is completely subservient to the Communists. Paisij gained a great reputation in Communist circles during the struggles of the partisans. His son is a member of the 'Politbureau' in Albania, and this is his qualification for being at the head of the Orthodox Church in his country. After the deposition of the Metropolitan Christopher Kissi for his alleged collaboration with the Fascists, Paisij was elected to succeed him in August 1949. He immediately notified the Russian Patriarch of his election, thanking the Russian Church for its help and assuring him that the Albanian Church had shared in the struggle for a just and lasting peace in the "indestructible democratic and anti-imperialist camp at the head of which stands the Soviet Union" (J.P.M., 1949, n. 9, p. 3). In August 1950 Paisij went as head of a delegation to Moscow where he

signed a solemn pact for collaboration between the Russian and Albanian Churches in the cause of peace with the Russian Patriarch and other representatives of the Church of Moscow. The Albanian Metropolitan by this action associated himself with the appeal for peace published on August 5th at Tiflis by the three Patriarchs of Russia, Georgia, and Armenia, in which the Vatican is arraigned as a war-monger (J.P.M., 1950, n. 8, p. 5 ff.). Following on this, the Albanian delegation published a brief article on its impressions of Moscow, and in this Stalin is presented as "the great standard-bearer of all those devoted to the progress of humanity and of all lovers of peace ... the leader of the Soviet peoples and of all progressive humanity." The mission had visited the mausoleum of Lenin with deep reverence. "That great genius of humanity", so says the article, "can sleep in peace, because his disciples continue his great work for the liberation of the peoples of the world from the capitalistic and feudal yoke" (J.P.M., 1950, n. 9, p. 24).

The Albanian Church sends its own candidates for the priesthood to Roumania where they are impregnated with the Communist spirit in the theological colleges. The Patriarch of Moscow supported the Albanian Church in the quarrel with the Ecumenical Patriarch in 1951 over the nomination by Constantinople of a bishop for the Albanian parishes in America. This report on the Church in Albania brings to an end our discussion of the allies of Moscow behind the Iron Curtain.

Churches Beyond the Iron Curtain

Jugoslavia is in actual fact a country with a Communist regime, but in 1948, finding itself at political odds with Moscow and seeking friendship with the West, it severed its ties with the Kremlin. Accordingly, it remains a problem as to whether we ought to include that nation on this or the other side of the famous Iron Curtain since changes in political matters have likewise resulted in repercussions in the ecclesiastical sphere.

The Serbian Patriarch Gabriel, as late as July 1948—Tito already having broken with Moscow—travelled to the Soviet capital to participate in the inter-Orthodox synod. Furthermore, it was he who made the proposal of conferring on the Russian Patriarch the power of introducing needed reforms in all the Orthodox Churches (J.P.M. Special Number, 1948, p. 66). It is not clear, however, whether or not he endorsed all the decrees of the synod. *Pravoslavnaja Rusj* (*Orthodox Russia*) denies this, whereas the patriarchal review published the signature of Gabriel and a photograph showing him at the side of Alexis as the latter endorsed the decree. After his return, Gabriel himself declared that he had not affixed his signature to all the decrees, particularly those embodying rash accusations against the Christians of the West. As a matter of fact, the attitude which he expressed at the time towards the Communist government was both firm and dignified. Nevertheless, following upon his death on May 7, 1950, the patriarchal review published a sufficiently favorable obituary in which the esteem

and affection which he had exhibited towards Russia and her ecclesiastical leaders is lauded. The notice then goes on to speak of him as an opponent of the Jugoslav government's friendly policy towards the West and a supporter of "little Mother Russia" as the only hope for Jugoslavia (J.P.M., 1950, n. 5, p. 22 ff.). Still for Easter 1950 Gabriel sent the Patriarch Alexis a cordial letter of best wishes (J.P.M., 1950, n. 5, p. 7).

Vincent, the new Patriarch elected in the month of July, 1950, lends support to the regime and takes an active part in the propaganda for the so-called complete religious liberty existing in Jugoslavia (Cf. *Politica,* Dec. 17, 1952). He caused the liberation from jail of the Metropolitan Joseph of Skoplje to appear as a token of consideration towards the Church on the part of the Communist government (EPS, 12-7-51). Nevertheless, he appears to exercise a certain reserve in regard to Moscow. One would search the numbers of the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow* in vain for even a faint allusion to his having informed the Patriarch of Moscow of his election. And if, for the Easter festivities, Vincent sends his best wishes to the Patriarch Alexis, this is due solely to the courtesy existing between the sister Churches.

From the first of July 1948, no representative of the Serbian Church has gone to Moscow, nor has any Russian hierarch travelled to Belgrade. The Patriarch Alexis officially rejected the order of 'Popular Liberation' which was conferred on him at the time as a sign of protest against Tito's anti-Soviet policy (J.P.M. 1950, n. 4, p. 5). The list of prohibited books and periodicals in Jugoslavia includes as well the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow,* which is banned from entering the country. Another symptom of the reserve towards Moscow can be seen from the evasive answer given by Vincent to the invitation to attend the new Bulgarian Patriarch's enthronement. He did not even send a representative to the ceremony.

Prescinding from the policy of the Patriarch, the attitude assumed by the Serbian hierarchy towards Russian Communism is one of restraint; and indeed, it would be a genuine mistake to speak of any capitulation of the Church before an atheistic government. Even as recently as 1952, the Holy Synod refused by a vote of 14 to 4 — with the Patriarch abstaining — to recognize the philo-Communist organization of the clergy, and such a courageous course of action stirred up a wave of reproach in the Communist press. Bishop Basileus Kostich was even physically attacked and, according to the account in the Communist paper *Politica* (8-10-53), only the intervention of the police saved him from being lynched by the furious crowd.

The small Orthodox Church of Finland is likewise situated at the very margin of the Iron Curtain. Its adherents number only about 80,000. The political position this small state occupies in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet colossus is a precarious one. The Finnish people loathes Communism, and the Finnish Orthodox Church

will not hear of any union with the philo-Communist Church of Moscow. Every attempt on the part of Moscow to bring about submission of the Church of Finland has failed so far. A Finnish council in 1950 postponed the question of an eventual reunion with Moscow until 1955, and a promise of autocephaly in the case of reunion made little or no impression. Such a decision on the part of the Finns induced the Patriarch to send a delegation to Finland in March 1952, officially for the purpose of visiting the Russian parishes and monasteries extant there. However, the delegates also paid a visit to the Archbishop of Finland and consulted with representatives of the Finnish Church. The patriarcal review (cf. J.P.M. 1952, n. 7, p. 6 ff.) does not make any particular mention of the result of these consultations, stating only that representatives of ecclesiastical associations had expressed the wish for an exchange of delegates between the Finnish and Russian Churches. In July 1953 we find the Metropolitan Nicholas of Krutitsi remaining in Finland for a fortnight at the invitation of the Finno-Soviet Association. *Izvestia* (August 18, 1953) also makes mention of this visit. The Metropolitan expressed his view that in Finnish ecclesiastical circles the idea of reconciliation with Moscow was slowly gaining ground (Cf. J.P.M. 1953, n. 10, p. 18). In this connection the Church in Finland made a friendly gesture towards Moscow when it gave recognition to the new Bulgarian Patriarch patronized by the Russian capital. The patriarchal review notes this fact with special satisfaction and emphasizes that this action of the Finnish Church which is dependent upon the Ecumenical Patriarch is opposed to the opinion of Constantinople which refused the same recognition (J.P.M. 1954, n. 1, p. 74, which refers to *Aamum Koitto,* the review of the Finnish Church, June 15, 1953).

* * * *

We now come to a review of those countries which lie beyond the zone of Communist influence. Moscow endeavors to infiltrate even there and if she is unable to exploit the pressure of Soviet power, she does make use of its wealth. The only hierarch in those countries who openly makes common cause with Moscow is the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Alexander, whose pro-Soviet declarations have caused quite a stir, particularly those made on the occasion of the peace congress held at Moscow in July 1951 when Alexander was present in person and signed the appeal for peace. Before leaving Russia, he made a number of statements to representatives of the press, expressing his admiration for the extensive activity of the Soviet regime and its great technical accomplishments. At the same time he accused America of thirsting for world domination and spoke critically of the Church in Greece and of the Patriarch of Constantinople, charging them with having done nothing for the cause of peace. He asserted, moreover, that the Vatican was fomenting a new war. Then in conclusion he

declared that the Church of Antioch would always remain loyal to that of Russia.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude from these statements that the patriarch in question is a genuine Communist. Yet the fact remains that he plays the Soviet game and has won for himself merited praise from that quarter. An instance of this occurred when Karpov, the atheistic and Communist Head of the Council for Affairs of the Orthodox Church, upon receiving the delegates to the Moscow peace congress in July 1951, paid special tribute to the Patriarch of Antioch on account of his efforts for peace (J.P.M. 1951, n. 8, p. 20). Later during the same year, in October, the patriarchal review dedicated a special article to the Antiochean Patriarch, extolling him as a champion of peace (p. 15 ff.). We also know that in July of 1950 Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad brought him a diploma naming him a Doctor of the Theological Academy of Moscow.

As was to be expected, through the influence of its patriarch the Church of Antioch manifested on every occasion its own solidarity with the patriarchate of the Russian capital. In fact, she alone of all the Churches of the free world participated in the deliberations of the Synod of Moscow in July 1948; and she sent representatives as well to the peace congresses at Moscow in July 1951 and at Zagorsk in May 1952. In the summer of 1948 she had received a church of her own in Moscow, and in December 1951 she sent delegates to the festivities celebrating the autonomy of the Church of Czechoslovakia. In April of the following year her representatives were to be found at the election of the new patriarch of Georgia, and in May 1953 they were in attendance even at the enthronement of the new Bulgarian patriarch. On each of these occasions the only Church to send representatives from the free world was that of Antioch. Further evidence of the link with Moscow can be seen from the fact that in 1950 the Antiochian Patriarch bestowed the highest decoration of his Church, that of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, upon the Metropolitan Eleutherius of Prague for his merits in effecting the forced conversion of many Catholics to the Orthodox Church. The same decoration was also conferred upon the Russian Archbishop of Mozaisk, Macarius, in 1953 (Cf. J.P.M. 1953, n. 4, p. 23).

This favorable disposition of the Patriarch towards the Soviet is shared as well by part of the bishops of the patriarchate, while others —perhaps in the majority—regard it with disapproval. One member of the delegation which travelled to Moscow in May 1953, the Metropolitan Athanasius of Hauran, is reported to have declared among other things: "If the Church were to work in close association with the government in the cause of peace throughout the world, she would thereby be furthering the progress of the whole world . . . It is quite right that the Russian Orthodox Church should live in harmony with the Soviet Government and that the latter on its part should assist the Church in her needs" (J.P.M. 1953, n. 6, p. 17). This same patriarch

was present in Bucharest in July of that year and took the occasion to vaunt the full religious freedom which he claimed existed in the Soviet Union, Roumania, and in the other Peoples' Republics (Cf. *Irénikon,* 1953, n. 3, p. 292).

On the other hand, there has been genuine criticism voiced in the face of the strange attitude assumed by the head of the Antiochian Church. At a holy synod of the Church of Antioch, it was resolved that the declarations made by the Patriarch at Moscow were to be attributed solely to him and that they were in no way to be taken as reflecting the views of the patriarchate as such, which did not at all desire Russian protection (Cf. *An-Nahar (The Day)* Sept. 21, 1951). The same question was also taken up in publications of the laity with some favoring the Patriarch, while others were opposed.

The sympathy of the Patriarch towards Russia can be partly explained from the fact that he was a student at Kiev and St. Petersburg, and also because traditionally the Antiochian Church has for centuries accepted protection and even material help from Russia; in fact, this latter assistance has assumed a larger proportion at the present time.

At Alexandria, the position in relation to Moscow taken by the Greek Patriarch Christopher is both vacillating and perplexing. It seems that he is not desirous of a break with Moscow, but being a Greek he cannot openly accept the hegemony of the Russians either. The peculiarity of this situation showed itself in 1947 when Christopher at first declared himself opposed to the council which the Russian Patriarch at the time wished to convoke in the Soviet capital. The Greek hierarch affirmed that the Ecumenical Patriarch alone had the right to call together a synod of the kind (Cf. *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 1948, p. 108). In February 1948 he told a number of newspapermen that he did "not think that under the present circumstances Moscow would be a suitable place for an ecumenical council" (Cf. *Ethnos, Feb. 23, 1948).* But then in October 1952 in the presence of journalists, the Patriarch of Alexandria denied that the Ecumenical Patriarch had the exclusive right of summoning an ecumenical council. In his opinion the supremacy of Constantinople had been based on its being the capital of the empire; but now that its territorial dominion had fallen away, its corresponding privileges had also lapsed, and Moscow could today with equal right lay claim to being the ecumenical patriarchate. He likewise declared that the Russian Church was completely independent from the Soviet regime (*Apostolos Andreas, Nov. 8, 1952).* Three years before, even the official publication of the Alexandrian Patriarchate had controverted the claim of Constantinople and denied that the Ecumenical Patriarch had the exclusive right in the matter of convoking a council (*Pantainos,* 1949, n. 6, pp. 91-108). This stand, of course, has been of real assistance to the cause of Moscow.

In other matters, the organ of the Alexandrian Patriarchate has

generally shown itself less philo-Soviet than the Patriarch and has more than once been critical of the peace propaganda of the Russian Church (Ibid., 1951, nos. 23, 24, 25); whereas the Patriarch, in his discourse at the end of the year 1950, declared that proposal of the Patriarch Alexis of summoning an ecclesiastical peace congress was inspired simply by religious motives and was not in any way linked with politics (*Pantainos* 1951, n. 1). It remains none the less true that he rejected the peace appeal of the Russian Patriarch, explaining that it did not express the genuine mind of the Russian Church whose position made it impossible for her to declare her real sentiments (*Irénikon*, 1951, n. 2, p. 216).

In reference to the new Bulgarian patriarchate, the Alexandrian publication took a definite stand against it (*Pantainos*, July 21, 1953, p. 335); the Patriarch himself, however, replied evasively to the invitation to participate in the ceremony of enthronement. He excused himself on the grounds of poor health, but said nothing to indicate that he opposed the election of the new patriarch. This attitude so offended Constantinople that the already pre-announced visit of the Patriarch Athenagoras to Alexandria was cancelled (*Proche Orient Chrétien*, 1953, p. 367). Very recently, too, *Pantainos* expressed itself quite unfavorably regarding the Church in Russia. "There are", it declared, "organs of the Church in Russia which are absolutely loyal to Christ. But who can guarantee that all of them are faithful servants of the Lord? Perhaps enemies of the Church have infiltrated themselves within her structure. It may be that some of them wish to exploit her to attain their objectives. The government of Moscow is atheistic, and for that reason no one can blame the United States for occasionally taking special measures" (March 11, 1954, pp. 126-27). The latter is a reference to the case in which the American Government refused a visa of entrance to the new exarch of the Russian Patriarch.

This difference of opinion between the Patriarch of Alexandria and the official publication should not be a matter of surprise because it is well known how strained relations are in general between him and his community. Indeed, it is because of this very situation that the holy synod has not been able to convene for several years. When it finally did assemble on January 21, 1954, its differences with the Patriarch flared up again, and the latter left the hall (*Apostolos Andreas*, Feb. 6, 1954).

The Patriarch himself seems to be quite favorably regarded by Moscow. On the occasion of the millennium of the Alexandrian Library, for instance, which was celebrated in November 1952, the Patriarch Alexis sent him a very cordial telegram of best wishes (J.P.M. 1952, n. 11, p. 25); and the Moscow *Journal* commemorated the event with a special article which was quite friendly in tone (J.P.M. 1952, n. 10, pp. 20-21). Moscow has good reason for its benevolent attitude towards the Patriarch Christopher, even if only for the fact that the latter

in spite of opposition continues to lend support to the idea of the convocation of a panorthodox council. This is a definite aid for the Russian cause since such a council today would be assured of a philo-Soviet majority. It appears, moreover, that Christopher maintains friendly relations with the Russian embassy at Cairo.

Meanwhile at Moscow, the periodical *Pantainos* is far less popular than its patriarch. In a recent issue of the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow* (Jan. 1954, pp. 69 ff.) a certain A. Alesin takes the Antiochian publication to task in an article entitled, "A False Position in an Important Matter." Here the writer is treating of the Church of the Russian emigrants, the status of which *Pantainos* considers as anticanonical.

* * * *

With a good deal of intensive effort, Moscow has been seeking to win over the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem, Timothy, to its side. In 1948, for instance, the Russian Patriarch sent a special ecclesiastical mission to the Holy City with the purpose of re-establishing the long-standing position of Russia as protector of Orthodoxy in the Holy Land. The relations of that "ecclesiastical mission" with the Patriarch of Jerusalem are very cordial indeed. Its members have been guests of the patriarchate a good number of times, two instances of this being in April 1951 and in June of that same year (J.P.M. 1951, n. 8, p. 42), while on the Feast of Pentecost in 1951 representatives of the Jerusalem Patriarchate were guests of the chief of the Russian mission. The Greek archbishop Athenagoras of Sebaste on that occasion was celebrant in the Russian cathedral and later at dinner that day proposed a toast to the Russian Patriarch (Cf. *Herder-Korrespondenz* 1952, p. 298). Further evidence of cordiality can be seen from a letter which Timothy of Jerusalem wrote on October 10, 1951, to the Patriarch Alexis in which he says that he has given a fraternal reception to the archimandrite Polycarp, the latter having been recently sent from Moscow as the new head of the Russian mission, and promises to extend to him every assistance possible (J.P.M., n. 1, p. 10 ff.).

When Jerusalem celebrated the 1500th anniversary of its patriarchate, Alexis sent a very courteous letter to mark the occasion (J.P.M. 1951, n. 10, p. 3 ff.); and Timothy made reply on November 1st of that year, thanking the Russian hierarch especially for the exhortation he had made in an encyclical letter, read in all the churches, inviting his faithful to share in the joy of the mother Church in Jerusalem (J.P.M. 1952, n. 1, p. 11).

It would seem, therefore, that relations between Moscow and Jerusalem are friendly enough. Whether or not Timothy is the recipient of financial aid from the former city we do not know, even though the temptation to receive it must be very real. In his letter of Easter greetings to Alexis in 1950, the Patriarch of Jerusalem likewise revealed the necessity in which his Church found itself; and this could be

interpreted as a request for material assistance (J.P.M. 1950, n. 5, p. 6). Yet, in a recent article appearing in the weekly *Apostolos Andreas* (March 6, 1954) the affirmation is made that a few years ago Timothy is reputed to have rejected the offer of an annual income deriving from the "Holy Places" existing in Russia and amounting to the sum of between 100,000 and 150,000 dollars annually. The author of the article, T. Papagiannopulos, writes from Athens and emphasizes the grave danger theatening the Patriarchate of Jerusalem from panslavic Communism with its resultant compulsory submission to the yoke of the Kremlin. But it seems, thanks be to God, that Timothy is still resisting, and the article gives him a good deal of praise for it. Even though it remains true that he accepted a complete set of ornate episcopal vestments from the Russian Patriarch (J.P.M. 1952, n. 1, p. 10 ff.), yet the fact that Timothy did not accept the invitation to attend the installation of the new Bulgarian patriarch and did not send representative to the ceremony is a sign that Jerusalem has not submitted to Moscow, despite the failure of the Palestinian prelate openly to protest against the election of the new patriarch (*Documentation Catholique,* Sept. 20, 1953, p. 1201 ff.).

It appears that the Russian mission to Jerusalem is developing an intensive propaganda campaign in favor of the Communists and that ideas sympathetic to the cause of Communism are widely disseminated among the Orthodox of Israel. The truth of this is perfectly clear, for example, in the case of the elections in November 1950. It is an actual fact that at Nazareth where the Orthodox are particularly numerous, the Communist party secured 42 % of the votes cast, while the mean average of the Communist vote in all of Israel comes to only 2.3% (Cf. *Das Hl. Land* 1952, nos. 3/4.).

In July of 1952 an Orthodox synod was held in the same city of Nazareth and during the proceedings a separation from the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was proposed in favour of adherence to either Antioch or even to Moscow. The idea, however, was rejected (*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* n. 2, p. 92).

Relations with Constantinople

The principal adversary of Moscow among the leaders of the Orthodox Churches is undoubtedly Athenagoras, the present Patriarch of Constantinople. He was formerly archbishop for the Greek immigrants in New York and an American citizen. This latter fact alone would suffice to render him suspect to the Russians. We may also take into consideration the statement he made to a number of journalists after his election in which he expressed his opinion concerning the position of the Ecumenical Patriarch: "Alexis of Moscow is mistaken because the Churches of Russia, Serbia, Poland, the Ukraine, Subcarpathia, Antioch, etc., all recognize the primacy of the Fanar notwithstanding their own autonomy . . . I am Patriarch of the Russians also because they too belong to me as Ecumenical Patriarch."

Still another thrust was his attack against Communism in the discourse he delivered on the occasion of his installation (Cf. *Chronos*, Jan. 23, 1949).

What causes us a good deal of surprise, however, are the courteous and apparently almost cordial relations between the recently elected patriarch and Moscow. On January 27, 1949, Athenagoras duly informed the Patriarch Alexis of his election, and he in turn made answer on April 18 with the customary letter of good wishes (J.P.M. 1949, n. 5, pp. 3-4). Shortly before, in March of the same year, Athenagoras had sent Alexis a very friendly letter of felicitation for his feast day (J.P.M. 1949, n. 6, p. 3). Then quite recently, on November 19, 1953, the Patriarch of Constantinople addressed a letter of condolence to the head of the Russian Church, lamenting the death of the latter's exarch in America, Macarius, and eulogizing his qualities (J.P.M. 1954, n. 1, p. 5).

These incidents, however, must not mislead us into thinking that there has been a betterment of relations between the "second" and "third Rome" which to this day remain bitter rivals. For years now there has been a sharp controversy between Moscow and Constantinople over the rights of the Ecumenical Patriarch, with the Russian faction inveighing especially against the interpretation given by its rivals to the famous twenty-eighth canon decreed by the Council of Chalcedon (e.g., J.P.M. 1950, n. 2, p. 36 ff; n. 3, p. 45 ff; n. 7, p. 5). The dispute over the autonomy of the Orthodox Church of Poland has served to embitter the conflict the more (J.P.M. 1950, n. 8, pp. 8-9), and last year the patriarchal organ of Moscow made repeated attacks against the Ecumenical Patriarch. In the April number of that publication an article by A. Bujevskij dealing with the patriarch Gregory VII of Constantinople and the Russian Church brings into relief once more the old grievances of the Russians against the Ecumenical Patriarch, as well as the fact that in 1924 the same Gregory demanded the abdication of the patriarch Tichon together with the abolition of the patriarchate and gave his support to the innovators of the "Living Church" (J.P.M. 1953, n. 4, p. 33 ff.).

In May of last year a letter from the Patriarch Alexis to Athenagoras was published which was a veritable catalogue of the sins committed by Constantinople. This was further amplified in an article published in August by A. Vedernikov dealing with the question of the prosynod (Cf. J.P.M. 1953, n. 5, p. 4 ff; n. 8, p. 7 ff; also *Herder-Korrespondenz*, Jan. 1954, p. 196 ff.). The principal criticism levelled at Constantinople concerns her tendency to extend her dominion over all the other Orthodox Churches; that is to say, her "papistry." Other salient accusations are the following: the participation of Constantinople in the Ecumenical Movement; her recognition of Anglican Orders; her convocation of the inter-Orthodox conference in 1923 and the decision made regarding the calendar; the creation in 1931 of the Russian exarchate subordinate to the Ecumenical Patriarchate;

her intervention in the affairs of the Finnish exarchate of the Russian Church; the concession of autonomy to Poland in 1924; her non-recognition of the autonomy granted by Russia to the Church of Czechoslovakia; the recognition of the anti-Soviet Churches of Russian emigrés; the refusal of ecclesiastical communion with the Church of Albania and with the metropolitan of Poland named by Moscow; the Hellenization of the Slavic monasteries on Mount Athos. Finally, the refusal to recognize the new Bulgarian patriarch courted by the Russians offers a further reason for disagreement (Cf. the letter of the Patriarch Athenagoras to the Holy Synod of Bulgaria dated April 25, 1953 and cited in *La Documentation Catholique,* Sept. 20, 1953, p. 1201 ff.).

It would seem that the Patriarch of Constantinople has somewhat modified the anti-Communist stand which he so clearly enunciated at the inception of his office, but this mitigation is supposedly in deference to the great number of Orthodox who find themselves behind the Iron Curtain among whom he wishes to grow in prestige, or at least whose respect he desires to maintain. But he has not changed in his opposition to Communism or to the Russian Patriarchate, its servant. In this connection, his remark to a Russian who visited him towards the end of last year is significant: "I love Russia and her suffering people; I pray and believe that the Church of Russia will rise again" (*Russian Thought,* Dec. 2, 1953; reported by N.N.Misutuskin).

The Position of Other Greek Churches

Still more negative in character is the attitude of the other Greek Churches in regard to Moscow. This is quite evidently so in the case of the Metropolitan of Cyprus and especially of the Synodal Church of the Kingdom of Greece. The relations with Moscow of the Orthodox Church on the Island of Cyprus are restricted to what is absolutely necessary. Its metropolitan Macarius refused the invitation to attend the Synod of Moscow in July 1948 and did not send a representative even to the jubilee celebration held in conjunction with the synod. He likewise gave orders to his priests to refuse the Sacraments to known Communists. Then when he died a few years ago, his vicar Kleophas informed the Russian Patriarch of his demise by a telegram which could scarcely have been more curt and to the point; Alexis replied in the same vein (J.P.M. 1950, n. 8, p. 10).

Moreover, the letters of greeting of the Church in Cyprus and that of the Russian capital which are sent for the different feast days are distinguished for their coldness (E.g., J.P.M. 1950, n. 2, p. 7). There is also the danger that Moscow is turning towards its own ends the propaganda for the annexation of the Island to Greece, a movement which has the support of the Church. Unfortunately, Communism numbers a sizeable amount of adherents among the Orthodox of Cyprus. The Turkish newspaper *Yeni Istanbul* declares that

of the 350,000 Greeks living there more than half are Communists (So, too, the *Giornale d'Italia,* Jan. 26, 1950).

The Church in Greece, finally, has rather strained relations with the Soviet capital. No representative from that Church attended the all-Russian council of January-February 1945 whereas all the other Churches had sent delegates. The crimes committed by the Communists during the civil war in Greece were certainly not conducive of sympathy for Moscow. Accordingly, relations with the Russian Patriarchate remain cold and formal. This can be seen from the exchange of telegrams between the two Churches on the occasion of the death of the archbishop Damaskinos and also at the time of the election of Spiridon as the new Archbishop of Athens and of all Greece. These telegrams of May-June 1949 are marked by their dry and formal civility and are in open contrast with the tone expressed in letters on similar occasions which are exchanged between Moscow and Churches friendly to her (E.g., Albania, J.P.M., 1949, n. 9, p. 3). When the jubilee of the arrival of St. Paul in Greece was being celebrated in 1951, the Russian Patriarch had no choice but to send a congratulatory letter to the Church there, but his message was strictly a matter of courtesy and none too cordial (Cf. J.P.M. 1951, n. 7, p. 5).

Conclusion

From all this, it is clear, thank God, that in the Orthodox world there are still Churches which resist the pressure from Moscow, but on the whole the true state of affairs is reflected by the title of this article: "The Separated East under the Shadow of Moscow." It remains a most unfortunate fact that the overwhelming majority of Orthodox Christians is subjected to the yoke of atheistic Communism. Prescinding from examples of glorious resistance in the face of Red atheism, the leaders of Orthodoxy have in the main exhibited a lamentable weakness. Hence, we are confronted with the sad spectacle of a Christian Church having in large measure capitulated before an atheistic power and letting itself be used as an instrument of propaganda for a system which is founded upon atheism and which has penetrated into the very marrow of that Church.

We do not believe that we are mistaken in thinking that this development is a consequence of that schism which began some nine hundred years ago. Schism, even from a purely material aspect, is certainly not a thing of minor importance because the state of separation from the one true Church of Christ cannot be a matter of indifference or of little moment. The Schism of 1054 had its roots in the system of a state Church, of the subservience of the Church to the State; and this system has now brought forth its latest and direst consequence: the enslavement of a Christian Church by an atheistic power which exploits it to further its own essentially anti-religious system. The Orthodox Church has for centuries been accustomed to serving the state, and consequently it has not known

how to reckon sufficiently with a state which has become the sworn enemy of God, while the Catholic Church alone has refused to yield to this atheistic monstrosity. We are not saying this vauntingly because it is not through any merit of our own that we are members of the Catholic Church: we know that her heroic resistance is due entirely to the superabundant grace of her divine Founder. We are simply stating a fact, the truth of which is attested by three Cardinals who are deprived of their liberty, dozens of bishops, and thousands of priests and religious who are languishing in prison and in concentration camps; and by hundreds of thousands of the faithful who in conditions of the gravest peril are resisting the enemies of the faith. By the grace of God, the Catholic Church is today, as always, the *signum levatum in nationibus* which by her very existence testifies to her divine origin. And it is our hope and our prayer that all our separated brethren may recognize this standard and return to the one true Church of Christ.

W. DE VRIES, S.J.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

AN IMPORTANT APPEAL ADDRESSED TO GERMAN LUTHERANS

In the spring number of Unitas *for this year (Vol. VI, p. 57), in the section relating to the Chair of Unity Octave observance, reference was made to a treatise published in Germany by Dr. Hans Asmussen, a prominent Lutheran thinker of Kiel, and three of his fellow churchmen. . This document called into question certain principles of the Evangelical Churches, and advocated a rappochement with the Church of Rome.*

Readers of Unitas *for the past several years are already familiar with the work of Dr. Asmussen in the ecumenical field. He is in the very forefront of the movement within the Lutheran Churches of Germany to revive basic ecclesiological concepts. He has likewise done much to present the teaching of the Catholic Church objectively to his co-religionists. In the following tract, he and his fellow clergymen take to task certain phases of the church life of their Evangelical brethren and make an appeal for a frank and searching appraisal of their stand on elementary concepts, particularly in regard to the nature of the Church.*

Both our office and our conscience compel us to write to all concerned and to bring to the fore a number of questions about the Christian Church, and especially Evangelical Christianity. Certain truths are to be found in the hearts of all, but voices are wanting to give expression to those thoughts. We are of the conviction that an end must be put to this paralyzing silence of discretion. This is why we are addressing ourselves to you.

I.

It is both right and just that our Churches be effectively concerned with the things of this world. We must confess, however, that the way this is too often done awakens within us the most serious misgivings. Not only are the political positions adopted by many an affront to the Church, but Church leadership itself seems to lack the authority to prune away these outgrowths or even to point out the right path to confused consciences.

The harm done goes very deep. The Apostle says that the Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth." Can we say this of our Church as well? Must there not be something at bottom which is unsound when the Church becomes a vacillating figure?

Is it not high time that we expressed ourselves on this state of affairs in all frankness and sobriety? Must not all those in whose hearts God has instilled a love for the Church enter within themselves and work for an amelioration of these conditions?

We believe that the wavering figure presented by the Church in our day is due mainly to her being torn asunder. In spite of this, the majority are content to believe in the idea that the unity of the Body of Christ who was offered for us and who wills to be present to

us as one Body — and consequently, the unity of one Lord, one faith, and one Baptism — is not visible.

II.

We entreat you particularly to consider the following points with us: Is it not too easy a way out to resign oneself to the rending of the Body of Christ as an unavoidable fate? How can prayer grow out of resignation, and how can we act if we are resigned? Is this not simply disobedience and a lack of faith?

Our lack of faith shows itself:

a) in that we are perfectly complacent when our Church which calls herself reformed is no longer even in conformity with the Lutheran Reformation. Can you really justify the fact that so much opposition resists the sincere efforts to restore the complete divine service of the Lutheran Mass, the central position of the holy Sacraments, and confession? How does it actually come about that so many Lutheran congregations and Churches are hindered from having a leadership in keeping with their profession of faith? Must it not be the ambition of all men of good will that we return with contrite hearts to our point of departure?

b) in that we act as if the Church had taken its origin only in 1517. Are we really disposed to relinquish so readily the great treasures of the pre-Reformation Church? Have we not every good reason to remind ourselves of the apostolic truth of the episcopacy and to learn to respect once more the great gifts that God has bestowed upon Christianity and mankind through monasticism? Do we still realize that it was St. Boniface who christianized Germany and that our way to the Apostles cannot by-pass him and the other Catholic missionaries?

c) in that we dispense ourselves in large measure from the deposit of truth held by the Apostles and Prophets. Do we really have the right to conceal the truth that grace works in the created order and that consequently it comes to us through created realities? Who gives us, after all, the authority to suppress insistently the doctrine of a reward for good works? And how can we account for the fact that we no longer affirm that the preaching of the Gospel, the priestly functions of divine worship, and the martyrdom of Christians are a part and a consequence of the sacrifice of Christ? Why do we allow ourselves to leave the problem of the function of Peter to philosophers and classical historians? Our want of faith consists precisely in our no longer looking upon the Church except as a reality of this world. Because of this we do not recognize her profound character, and for that very reason we no longer live in communion with the saints and the perfectly righteous.

Are you not also of our opinion that this admission of our deficiencies should finally lead us to draw the necessary conclusions? Certainly, we have not written anything in this letter which has not already been the common possession of Evangelical scholarship for a long time. Nevertheless, our Church acts as though this research work was a kind of private concern of a few specialists in theology.

III.

Does not a particular discredit fall upon the Church life of our day since we strictly refuse to draw logical conclusions from the knowledge which we and many other Christians in Germany have gained of the Roman Catholic Church? We Christians of Germany should be especially desirous of being on good terms with that Church since it is our particular lot to live and work in common with its members.

Is it really fitting that the large denominations should act as though nothing had happened when Germans listen gratefully to the Gospel from Evangelical as well as from Roman Catholic lips in literature, over the radio, and in the press? Our Lord will not pardon us on the last day for having forgotten in less than ten years that as Christians we suffered alike in brotherhood.

We do not in any way claim that the two major denominations in Germany are ready for reunion. We know that the truth still divides us; but we are equally aware that truth divides the Evangelical Churches and their theologians. In this respect our relationship to the Roman Catholic Church does not constitute something exceptional. Should we reprehend the Roman Catholic Church for not despairing like many Evangelical Churches of pronouncing articles of faith as binding for the time we are on earth? We entreat our Roman Catholic brethren to tell us why that which in our belief separates us from them makes us share in a lesser measure than they in the splendor of Christ — for that is really the heart of the matter.

IV.

If you now believe with us that these questions of ours have drawn attention to a complexus of problems that cry out for an answer in our day, particularly in Germany, then be kind enough to make your address known to one of the undersigned. We know that all over Germany and beyond her borders similar questions are being discussed. But no reunion has as yet taken place. Nevertheless, tomorrow might well be too late.

Perhaps you may have already become a member of some circle, a prey to needs which are identical with the above or imbued with a solicitude akin to ours. In that case we urge you to see to it that relations are established between that group and us. As soon as we can determine the number of those who like us are swayed by the same questions, we will endeavor to summon a meeting of all those concerned. It will perhaps be necessary to set up a more compact association within which we would take part in special services and set about to accomplish difficult tasks. But the appeal that we have voiced in this letter must first of all be heard in German-speaking lands. In the near future we plan to treat more in detail of the questions that we have raised above.

Offenbach-Main
Second Sunday after Epiphany, 1954

Dr. Hans Asmussen. D.D., Kiel. Schillerstr. 27
Pfarrer Ernst Fincke, Frankfurt a.M., Töplitzstr. 7

Pfarrer Max Lackmann, Gehlenbeck, Kreis Lübbecke (Westf.)
Pfarrer Wolfgang Lehmann, Offenbach-Main, Geleitstr. 104

* * * *

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S VIEWS ON UNITY AND A REPLY

On the occasion of the 155th anniversary of the Church Missionary Society, which was celebrated by a rally held in London on May 4th, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher of Canterbury was present as one of the specially invited speakers. Excerpts from his address were published in the Ecumenical Press Service bulletin of May 14. Since they relate in a particular manner to the theme of unity we are quoting them here for the purpose of commentary:

"From the disunited world" said the Archbishop, "we can learn something of the nature of the evil which is to be overcome, not only in the world itself, but in the disunited Church: for wherever disunity exists, it exists by reason of the same failure of the human spirit to respond to the perfect will of God." The hardest is for honest men and Christians "when the price to be paid to put an end to some disunity seems itself to be a betrayal of the truth . . . How then can progress be made at all in reconciling the divisions between the great Christian traditions and the divided Churches which embody them?

"Two things only can I say here. First, the more we can all share with one another in life and in prayer and in worship (even if for the present it must be outside the Sacraments) the better. This is the first essential, and it raises no theological barrier at all . . . For divided Christians not to allow themselves to pray together in the name of Christ is not merely an offence against one another, it is blasphemy against Christ. It is significant that all who come into the circle of ecumenical fellowship, even reluctantly, whether within the confines of a parish or in the Councils of Churches, find liberation and an enlarged vision of Christ's purpose and an increased sense of His presence with the Church — even if at the same time the closer view of the dividing barriers causes a deeper sense of frustration.

"Secondly, the phrase 'visible unity' as applied to the Church can bear more than one significance. It can mean the visible unity in Christ displayed among a great number of Churches by the existence of the World Council of Churches, and do not let us minimise the significance of that unity, rudimentary though it is. It could mean, at the other end, the visible unity of a single integrated, constitutional structure embracing all the uniting Churches: and let us frankly recognize that no such unity is yet possible or can yet be foreseen which would not involve grievous betrayal by perhaps every Church of some part of its conviction, of what it holds to be the truth of Christ . . .

"The Church of South India was, if I may use the language of warfare, a break-through which has established a still precarious bridgehead of advance. But if we are to advance on a broad front, it must be not yet by unity of organisational command but by ever increasing

freedom of inter-communication and of inter-communion under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"Progress can only be made by a more careful appraisal of what really are essentials of Christ's truth . . . but remembering the fatal ease with which the world sometimes ruins and Churches may ruin a good cause by their method of defending or promoting it. That on the one hand: and on the other, there must be a far readier willingness between Churches to allow freedom to differ on almost everything except the substance of the historic creeds. We must somehow learn in Christ, to rejoice in one another's orthodoxies even while as members of one family we have to endure many of one another's heresies."

In conclusion, Dr. Fisher affirmed that "it is utterly true that only Christ can lead His Church onwards to such unity as He commands."

For the benefit of our readers we should like to make a few comments on the text to be found in the EPS news release. It is fragmentary in nature, and perhaps the rest of Dr. Fisher's address would at least to some degree explain it. For that reason we are making the following observations reservedly.

"First," Dr. Fisher is quoted as saying, "the more we can all share with one another in life and in prayer and in worship (even if for the present it must be outside the Sacraments) the better." What can the participation in the worship of others mean if not to offer the same worship as theirs, for example, in giving Christ the same title, offering God the same sacrifice, paying the same honor to the Blessed Virgin Mary? But what if the others do not admit the divinity of Christ, or do not consider the Mass as a sacrifice, or doubt the perpetual virginity of Mary? In order to have the same worship, people must simply have the same faith. It is the unity of faith that we must first of all strive to restore.

Dr. Fisher goes on to distinguish two meanings of the term "visible unity" in the Church: one of these has been realized; the other is not yet possible nor can yet be foreseen. The "visible unity" achieved is that of the World Council of Churches. But is it not a fact that the World Council is made up of Churches visibly and really separated which are seeking a remedy for their division? There is only one truth which is imposed as an obligation on the members of the Council — the divinity of Christ — and who can certify that all of them understand it in the same sense? What is visible, at the most, is the effort to arrive at unity; this is certainly not unity itself.

That "visible unity" which Dr. Fisher declares is not "yet possible or can yet be foreseen" is the only unity which merits the name, provided that it comprises unity of faith, unity of government, and unity of worship. The amalgamation brought about in the Church of South India is neither a form of such unity nor does it constitute progress towards it. (Cf. *Unitas,* French ed., 1948-V, 2). The realization of that genuine and visible unity of all Christians requires, of course, changes in the beliefs of those who are outside the pale of unity. But these changes — far from involving the "grievous betrayal"

alleged by the Anglican primate — are in reality a progression towards the truth, for the Church of Christ is as true as it is one. Why, then, must such changes be termed impossible? The grace of Christ, the inspiration of the Holy Spirit at work in them — these may be more manifest today than in the past. It is incumbent upon men not to resist but to follow the divine impulse wherever it may lead them.

Dr. Fisher also dreams of extending the practice of intercommunion. But here again, the very term "intercommunion" — that is to say, communion between differing communions — is contradictory. What would St. Paul have said — or the Fathers of the Church — if they had been invited "to rejoice in one another's orthodoxies even while as members of one family we have to endure many of one another's heresies"? What would Newman have said, even as an Anglican, and what an admirable tract would he not have written against such a neglect of the demands of truth!

For some time now, the Archbishop of Canterbury has expended a good deal of effort for union with the Free Churches in spite of divergences in matters of faith. Would it not be laudable on his part if he were to expend as much effort in working for reunion with the Church of Rome, which is the only way to arrive at the attainment of unity?

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

* * * *

TOWARDS A SOUND ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT
A COMMUNICATION FROM TAIZE

We have at different times in the past made references in the pages of Unitas *to the Calvinist religious community of Taizé in France. Its members, who number about twenty-five, have dedicated themselves to work and prayer for unity. The Prior of the community, Pastor Roger Schutz, has sent us the following reflections which our readers will, for the most part, find stimulating:*

The foundation of all ecumenicity finds its warrant in the prayer of Christ: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father in Me and I in Thee . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John XVII).

On the eve of His death, Christ is solicitous about the disunion among Christians. He is insistent on the fact that if those who confess His name are disunited among themselves, if there is not one mind between them — the world will not be able to believe that Christians are children of the same Father. The Priestly Prayer is Christ's own appeal to us for unity. In it He gives each of us the vocation of making all one in Himself.

In reality, if we follow St. Paul's thought, Christ cannot be divided. In other words, the Body of Christ is one, and all those who bear the name of Christian must see to it that their disagreements are not a cause of scandal to those who do not believe. Otherwise the world might be led to believe that the Body of Christ can be divided — something completely contrary to the mind of the Apostle.

Today the Christian conscience is severely shaken by the divisions

that split the ranks of Christendom. We are aware that the world has the right to mock us when we so lightheartedly proclaim a God of love and at the same time, as sons of the same Father, have contempt for one another. The existence of the de-Christianized masses and the pagans in the mission fields would seem to put our witness under interdict.

In fact, the numberless masses untouched by Christian teaching have aroused our conscience to see the imperative need for unity among ourselves and given us a sense of catholicity. A great inspiration has fallen far and wide upon the differing Christian denominations and given rise to the question: What does it mean to belong to the Church, the Body of Christ? There is no doubt that the only way for believers to rediscover the universal values of the unity of the Church is for them to shake themselves free from their own preconceptions in a spirit of growing generosity, and with a true sense of the bonds of friendship that link man to man. The time has gone when one could love those only who confessed Christ in the same way as he, and prayed as he did. For if I love those only who love me, have I done anything extraordinary? Do not the pagans do as much? (Matthew V:46). It is here that we can see which way the ecumenical spirit wishes to lead us. The question is: are we willing to pay the price?

Is is clear that the unity Christians seek will not come about without mutual sacrifices, without a purity of intention in our love for Our Lord Jesus Christ. Only in this spirit may one attempt to examine what must be the foundation of a sound ecumenical movement; and to do this, one must first clear the ground of all harmful forms of ecumenism.

I. *THE WRONG WAY:*

a. *Deliberate neglect of the real causes of division (Le Confusionisme):* Some Christians deliberately make light of the real causes of Christian disunity. It is sufficient, they think, to confess the name of Jesus and unity will follow. To their mind, the reasons for our divisions are to be found only in the realms of psychology, history, and language. This is dangerous thinking. The true ecumenical spirit demands unflinching frankness. It is quite useless to deny the existence of the real causes of disunion by refusing to delineate the points of disagreement. To refuse to do this is to act the ostrich, as if all that were needed to realize the unity we seek could be won by a mutual embrace.

b. *The 'practical' approach:* This type of mind tends to recognize the fundamental divergences in matters of doctrine, but sees these as no more than the diabolical contrivances of theologians. It consequently refuses to enter into a comprehension of their studies and is content to search out a unity of a purely practical kind. It considers, besides, that social and philanthropic works, which should unite Christians over and above their differences, are quite sufficient of themselves to iron out the difficulties built up by the theologians. On the other hand, it advocates a united front against the forces of materialism, as if it were possible for Christians to go along together in a spirit

of charity in a combat with other men who are ignorant of the faith and living according to pagan concepts.

Certainly we have no wish to deny the usefulness of practical co-operation, a thing which even recent encyclicals have recommended. But this useful activity must never be confused with genuine ecumenism. The inspiration behind the Ecumenical Movement is not directed to joint activity but to the birth in men's hearts of a sincere desire to see Christians, separated from one another into different sociological groups, once more united into one.

c. *Federalism:* Equally foreign to right thinking on this matter is the idea that a federation of the Churches would bring about the hoped-for unity. There is no analogy between the Mystical Body of Christ and the formula of federalism, however happy a solution this might be in other phases of human society.

d. *The eschatological approach:* For those holding this view, unity between the different Christian groups would be a purely invisible entity. It would become fully manifest when Christ returns in triumph at the end of time. This return will see the gathering together of all Christians around the great Shepherd. But yet, true ecumenism is born in the heart of man when his conscience is struck by the scandal of today—the visible division of those who confess the same Lord. We cannot say just how or at what moment in history real unity will become a reality—for both the means and the time are in God's hands —but we do assert that the Ecumenical Movement is an inspiration of the Holy Spirit to reunite Christians in a visible unity. It is Our Lord's own appeal which directs our efforts towards union, not a certainty of human success.

e. *Reunionism:* We must remember that it is dangerous for us, mere men, to be impatient. We exist in time and fret at delay. But the Lord is Master of all time ... and the patience of the Lord is no empty phrase. We must learn to wait for certain things to come to maturity.

In this connection, the Church of Rome recognizes that her separated brethren of today are Christians who receive Christ through the medium of a tradition which precedes them and goes beyond them.

Once these statements are accepted, it can be said that reunionism constitutes an erroneous ecumenism. It is in fact, the transference of individual proselytism on to the collective plane. It is an attitude of mind which looks to the return of certain fractional groups to the unity of the Church of Rome. But to hasten the harvest is to compromise real unity. In the expression 'return' we find one of the key-words which should never be used, for it implies the denial of the existence in other faiths of all that ought to bring about this return. (1)

We should use, rather, the word 'fulfilment', for this term implicitly

(1) Our readers, nevertheless, know - and our separated brethren likewise know - that a Catholic attributes no other end to his 'ecumenical' endeavors than the return of non - Catholics to Catholic unity. But this does not mean that the immediate end of an ecumenical discussion is the conversion oft he non-Catholic. (Editor's note)

recognizes that other Churches have certain marks of the truth, even if they do not have the whole truth.

Reunionism suggests an erroneous picture to Christians who are not open to this inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this conception is psychologically incapable of being assimilated, for it seems to those who should reunite as a total denial of the work of their fathers in the faith. On the simple plane of charity and love, this is something to be avoided.

* * * *

Now that we have attempted to bar the way to certain oblique pathways of ecumenism, we should like to circumscribe certain attitudes of mind which are incompatible with the ecumenical spirit, even though those concerned should be on the right road.

II. *CERTAIN ATTITUDES OF MIND WHICH ARE UNACCEPTABLE*

a. *Sectarianism:* Sectarianism is to be found on all levels of human thought. There is a subtle temptation here to equate oneself with one's beliefs, to be convinced of one's own superiority because one has the truth, to give way to dogmatic introspection—this is sectarianism. We must be fully aware that all of us are liable to fall into this snare. This is a danger especially for those who have a theological vocation.

b. *Integrism:* We must not suppose that this heading refers to the concern for keeping the deposit of faith intact. No one would dare to deny that to transmit this treasure, to defend the integrity of the faith and to give the spiritual patrimony of the Church in its entirety to those who will come after us, is in fact to think and act as a true disciple of the Lord.

But the inspiration of the Ecumenical Movement should induce us to examine carefully the way we set about transmitting the sacred deposit of faith. Let us recall that Catholic integrism was condemned at the beginning of the century, but it is still possible for it to appear again under certain subtle forms, for its roots lie deep in the "old man", and there is constant need for new pruning.

Integrism is to be found equally, for example, within the ranks of Protestants themselves whenever they feel that any reconception of the spiritual patrimony to be defended by them would be an act of disloyalty to their fathers who struggled before them. Such an attitude deliberately blocks the way to any form of ecumenism. All that derives from the sons of those who fought against their fathers is evil by definition. This is to defend what one believes to be the sacred deposit of faith on a field of battle rather than on the plane of truth in the bond of charity.

There is one Church today that has taken up a particularly interesting position vis-a-vis integrism. The Greek Orthodox Church used to assert that it alone possessed the full truth, but one of its representatives recently admitted that this Church had been constrained by the Lord to take part in ecumenical discussions and that it did not repent of having been so led. It took part in these at the beginning for purely

practical reasons, to be united with other Christians in the sphere of charitable co-operation, and after several decades it saw itself constrained to make answer for its faith. However, it defends the integrity of the faith it professes even while accepting fully the idea of mutual discussions. The results of this have not been slow to appear, for by this means numerous Protestants have come to learn of certain truths and ecclesiastical realities which up until then they had not known.

III. *THE RIGHT DIRECTION FOR ECUMENISM*

The method we followed in order to arrive at genuine ecumenicity was to clear the ground; that done, the sure roads to it will appear almost of themselves.

a. *Mutual discussions:* This means that we must not content ourselves with long monologues in which the only real listener is oneself. We must rather learn to be silent in order to understand and penetrate the thought and the position of those conversing with us. To discuss means that we are not to pursue our own ways of thinking in the format and categories to which we are accustomed, but seek to present our answers in accordance with the other's pattern of thought so that his mind will be opened to them. To discuss means that we avoid stock polemical arguments and that we try to see the other as he wishes to be and not in the form which centuries of sterile opposition have portrayed him to us. It is a matter of 'becoming acquainted', of mutually entering into each other's minds, of familiarizing oneself with a theology, a philosophy, a spirituality, and even sometimes a scale of moral values so different from one's own that it seems to have no affinity with it whatever. And why? Simply because we must love one another in the truth.

All this entails a certain amount of time spent in learning the right approach, in clearing away mistrust, and in showing the other what one really is. Discussion is the direct opposite of controversy.

b. *Purity of intention:* This attempt to arrive at mutual understanding must be made without any ulterior motives. Let us say again that we are together because God sends us; we are not together in order to convert one another. To enter the field of the Ecumenical Movement with the premeditated intention of drawing the other over to one's own position is really to fail to be true to its spirit. (2) This purity of intention will also make an irenical exchange of ideas feasible and achieve a certain abatement of tension—all leading up towards great initiatives in the Church of Jesus Christ. In a spirit of mutual confidence we will accept this straightforward exchange in a language and vocabulary, and in a way that will bring about a deepening of mutual understanding.

c. *Objectivity:* Our emotional background and our subjectivity tend to charge our expressions and our attitude with a content which those who enter into conversation with us are incapable of assimilating. We must, therefore, constantly endeavor to make our response as ob-

(2) See footnote above.

jective as possible by continual reference to the Scriptures and to the Christian thought of the first centuries which has been enshrined in the creeds of the great Councils.

d. *Prayer:* Any work for ecumenism without prayer for unity would be a work of despair. Prayer revives our hope and love when we are faced with difficulties mounted up by man's sin and by differing human traditions. It encourages us when we meet the impasses that constantly stand in the way of progress. Our prayer should as a general rule comprise four important elements:

— *Self-abasement:* We will make a common confession of our sins and humbly admit our guilt for any persecution we may have inflicted on one another.

— *Petition:* This will place our ecumenical work on a plane of co-operation with God. Unity can never be achieved without this mysterious action of prayer in God: in Him and by Him we become instruments of unity.

— *Recalling the truth of the Communion of Saints:* This will make us remember next that the Church has vast dimensions.

— *Thanksgiving:* This will help us to realize that God alone is the author of unity: tranquility can be found in Him alone.

Here is the essential equipment for our journey. There is one point that we should like to insist upon once again. We know that the ways of God are not our ways; so to learn them, one of the most important virtues in our mutual discussions is the virtue of patience. Divisions are much more easily created than unity. The fulfilment of our desires is conceivable only if we are patient.

Finally we think it necessary to emphasize a certain direction which ought to determine our entire course towards unity.

Laymen and theologians alike should always think of the humble and common people of God when they devote themselves to the work of ecumenism. In the often simple gesture of some poor woman there is a sense of devotion which makes us incline less towards rigorism and renders us more conscious of the fact that Christian truth finds its expression in all classes of the people of God. Each one receives his own measure, the charism according to which he will show this or that facet of the thought of the Church; but no one can fail to listen with respect to the faith which completes his own, for it is a part of the harmony of the great choir of the Communion of Saints.

In this deference to the humble, we should recall the prophecy in which it was given to the Virgin Mary to announce that through the coming of Christ the powerful and the strong would be brought low and the weak and the little ones be exalted. Are not we churchmen often enough the strong of this world? It is then a good thing that these humble folk, as well as others, have a voice in the chorus of the militant faithful who sing in the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

PASTOR ROGER SCHUTZ
Frère prieur de Taizé

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

The Eve of the Evanston Assembly

Preparations for the approaching Second World Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Illinois, are now well under way after many months of careful planning. According to the Ecumenical Press Service, the plenary sessions of the Assembly will begin on Sunday, August 15, and continue daily until August 31st, inclusive. There will be three such sessions a day during the time of the Assembly.

Those who will participate in this important ecumenical gathering will consist of approximately 500 delegates who will represent 161 member Churches in 48 countries. In addition to this number, there will be many consultants, youth delegates, observers from Churches not belonging to the World Council of Churches, and other accredited visitors. Apart from newspapermen and other personnel, this brings the number of those attending the sessions to some 1200 persons.

The main theme of this Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches will be: "Jesus Christ, the Hope of the World". This theme will be presented to the delegates at the opening plenary session by Dr Marc Boegner of France, one of the six presidents of the World Council. It will then be discussed in its various aspects in the remaining plenary sittings which will be presided over successively by one of the World Council presidents.

Subordinate to the main theme of the Assembly, the Advisory Committee of the Council has prepared six subsidiary topics for the consideration of the delegates. These topics are the following:

1. Faith and Order—Our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Churches.
2. Evangelism—The Mission of the Church to Those outside her Life.
3. Social Questions—The Responsible Society in a World Perspective.
4. International Affairs—Christians in the Struggle for World Community.
5. Inter-group Relations—The Church amid Racial and Ethnic Tensions.
6. The Laity—The Christian in his Vocation.

The presiding officers of the Assembly will be as presidents: Bishop Eivind Berggrav of Norway, Pastor Marc Boegner of France, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of Washington, and Archbishop Athenagoras, the Metropolitan of Thyateira. Other discussion leaders will be Archbishop Brilioth of Sweden; Dr Henry P. Van Dusen of New York; Dr John Mackay of Princeton; the Bishop of Chichester; Dr Franklin C. Fry of the United States, and Bishop C. K. Jacob of South India.

On the list of accredited speakers we find among others the following names: Bishop Dibelius of Berlin; Dr Charles Malik of the Lebanon; Professor Edmund Schlink of Germany; Professor R. L. Calhoun of the

United States; Bishop Anders Nygren of Sweden; Dr C. W. Ranson of Great Britain; Dr Oliver S. Tomkins of England; Professor G. Florovsky of New York; Dr Martin Niemöller of Germany; Dr R. B. Manikam of India; Professor R. Niebuhr of the United States; and Dr O. Frederick Nolde, also of the United States.

The Assembly itself—which, according to the Constitution of the W.C.C., is the "principal authority in the World Council"—will officially open on August 15 with a special inauguration service in the First Methodist Church in Evanston sponsored by the Presidents of the World Council of Churches. Bishop Oxnam will preach the sermon for the occasion. The same church will be used on each day of the Assembly for morning and evening services by the different denominations taking part in the proceedings at Evanston. Another important event planned for the opening day will be a public service of worship for 100,000 persons at Soldiers' Field in Chicago. This will take place on the evening of August 15th.

World Council Message for Pentecost

This year the Presidents of the World Council of Churches once again addressed a message for Pentecost Sunday to the member Churches of the Council. The text of the message reads as follows:

"As Presidents of the World Council of Churches we greet the Churches participating in the W.C.C., their congregations and members. We request them to join in prayer at this time for the Church Universal and in particular this year for the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches to be held at Evanston in August.

"Our Lord has promised his disciples: 'You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth.' The day of Pentecost marked the beginning of the fulfilment of that promise. Down the centuries, in spite of sins and schisms, the work of Christ in his Church has gone forward and spread throughout the world. Let us first therefore on this day give thanks to God for the Church and for its witness in all parts of the world.

"In this year the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches will seek to proclaim anew that Jesus Christ is the only hope of the world. According to the New Testament the unity and the hope of the Church belong together. When we read the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, the word 'one' rings in our ears with the impressive reiteration of a church bell. We are brought face to face with the great simple facts of God's revelation.

"Four of these unities are specially relevant for us today: One Body, one Spirit, one Hope, one Lord. The people of God are meant to live as one body. That body owes its life to the Holy Spirit. The whole body looks in one and the same direction, for it has heard one and the same call, the call to hope. The ground of that hope is the Lord 'who was and is and is to be', who has come in the flesh, who promised to be always with his people and who will come again as victor over sin and death.

"In a world in which true hope has become rare, the Church is called to proclaim in word and deed that there is hope, because there is Jesus Christ. In a divided world it has to show that this hope brings men together. Let us pray that the Second Assembly may be used of God to make us all better witnesses of that joyful truth.

"God, our Father, who has given to Thy Church a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, make us worthy of our common calling to witness to that hope. Son of the Father, our Saviour Jesus Christ, confirm in us the assurance that Thou art present with Thy people and that Thy victory will be fully manifested. Holy Spirit, the Comforter, by the power of Thy fellowship unite all the scattered children of God together in the joyful service of Thy Kingdom, and so guide the Assembly of the Churches that all may be done according to Thy will: and to Thee O God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory, now and for ever more".

The Presidents of the World Council of Churches: Athenagoras of Thyateira; Eivind Berggrav; Marc Boegner; Geoffrey Cantuar; John R. Mott; G. Bromley Oxnam. (EPS)

Ecumenical Youth Congress at Amsterdam

During the last week of March a Youth Congress, made up mostly of students of college level, was held in Amsterdam to discuss the main theme of the Evanston Assembly. It was attended by Dr. Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the W.C.C., by the Ecumenical Youth Council of the Netherlands, and by the Dutch Council of Churches. The delegates attending included members of the Dutch Reformed Church, Lutherans, Remonstrants, Old Catholics, Baptists, Anglicans, and two Roman Catholic observers.

Since the principal theme was "Christ, the Hope of the World", the sessions of the Congress were patterned after those of the Evanston Assembly, with different sections discussing one or the other of the subsidiary topics. The youth delegates were also particularly concerned about the outcome of the World Assembly this summer. At Amsterdam the Churches made the decision to stay together, while at Lund they had dwelt upon the differences between them. This time the Congress expressed the conviction that the Churches had to go further; they must either advance or retreat. There is need, it declared, for a common biblical witness to the world. (EPS)

World Anglican Convention at Minneapolis

A large gathering of Anglican bishops, clergy, and laity from every continent will come together this summer at Minneapolis. The plans for this important enterprise were begun by the last Lambeth Conference in 1948. The Bishops decided at that time that between the years 1948 and 1958 a congress should be convened with representatives from all the dioceses of the Anglican Communion. The Episcopal Church of America will be the host for this congress which will hold its sessions

from August 4 to the 13th. More than 400 delegates are expected to attend, coming from all the 22 provinces and 328 dioceses of the Anglican Church.

The general theme for the convention will be: "The Call of God and the Mission of the Anglican Communion". The chief topics for discussion include the worship, the message, and the work of the Anglican Church, while a good deal of attention will be given to the nature of the vocation of that communion. Under this heading those attending will discuss the place of the Anglican Communion in history, its theological position, its structure, its place in Christendom, and its relation to other denominations.

The preachers at the opening session will be the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in America and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Other important speakers listed are the Bishop of London, whose topic will be: "Our Place in History, and Our Theological Position"; and the Archbishop of Quebec who will discuss: "The Structure of the Anglican Communion." *(Church Times).*

Union Plan for American Presbyterians

The 166th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America met in Detroit in May and voted unanimously to approve a merger plan which would unite 3,500,000 American Presbyterians into one body. This decision is looked upon as an important step forward in the recent reunion efforts among Presbyterians in the United States.

At the present time there are eleven different branches belonging to the Presbyterian Communion, with three of the largest denominations taking the initiative in having the merger plan accepted. Besides the group meeting in Detroit, the two most important branches of that communion are the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern) and the United Presbyterian Church of North America.

The union plan in question will be placed before the separate Assemblies this year for their approval; and should this be obtained, the plan will then be sent to the local presbyteries for their ratification. If the latter respond favorably, the union between the three major groups will become effective in 1956 at a joint meeting. The unification achieved will then be known as the Presbyterian Church of the United States. (EPS)

Anglican Prelate Opposes United Services

In a message for Pentecost Sunday to his diocese, the Anglican Bishop of Exeter expresses doubts concerning the wisdom of sponsoring "united services." The prelate recalls that a year ago he had given permission for such services in connection with the Coronation. Now he is of a different mind in the matter. The *Church Times* of London quotes him as saying:

"The trouble about allowing united services on occasions of national importance is that just precisely when our divisions are really felt by ordinary people to be intolerable, something is done to make them just tolerable. And then we all go on as before.

"Are not these national occasions just the moments, perhaps, when we ought to be more rigid than ever, and so help people to understand how terrible our divisions are?

"In this matter of reunion, the real sin against the Spirit seems to me to be an indifference to its scandal, a not-minding-much-about-it."

Church of Scotland Statement on Ecumenism

At its General Assembly, the Church of Scotland recently adopted a statement relating to the cause of Christian unity, and requested that it be read in the individual churches either on Whitsunday or on the opening day of the Evanston Assembly on August 15.

The text of the statement, as issued by the Ecumenical Press Service reads as follows:

"The Church of Scotland, believing in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and acknowledging one baptism for the remission of sins, affirms its intention of seeking closer relations with every Church with which it stands in fundamental doctrinal agreement, but from which it is separated in matters of government and the ordering of the ministry.

"In its approach to other Churches in which it discerns the one Body of Christ, the Church of Scotland desires to look beyond the divisions of history to the ultimate fulness and unity of the Church's life in Christ, and to affirm its readiness to consider how the contribution of all such Churches may be embraced within that unity and fulness; always, however, in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

"In such approaches the Church of Scotland would seek to join, humbly penitently, with its sister Churches in fulfilment of Christ's prayer that all who believe in Him might be one."

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Pope Calls Pius X Providential Saint of Our Times

The solemn rite of canonization at which Pius X was declared a Saint of the Church was celebrated at St. Peter's on the 29th of May. It was a most impressive ceremony with some forty Cardinals, over four hundred bishops, and with thousands of the faithful in attendance from all over the world. His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, presided over the ceremony and delivered a notable address in which he extolled the virtues and accomplishments of the sainted pope.

After a brief introduction, the Holy Father declared that Pius X ". . . solemnly announced the program of his pontificate in his very first encyclical (*E Supremi* of October 4, 1903) in which he stated that his only aim was 'to re-establish all things in Christ' (Eph. I-10), that is . . . to restore all things to unity in Christ. But where is the road that leads to Christ, he asked himself, looking in compassion at the hesitating, wandering souls of his time. The answer, valid yesterday as well as today and always, is: the Church. His primary aim, then, which he unceasingly pursued until death, was the movement of souls towards Jesus Christ."

The Pope then showed how, with this aim in mind, his predecessor had undertaken the great work of "recasting the body of Church law in such wise as to give the Church a more ordered life, greater certainty and flexibility of movement, such as was demanded by an age typified by growing dynamism and complexity." God, said the Holy Father, had abundantly blessed this special endeavor of Pius X, "so that the code of canon law will remain for future ages the great monument of his pontificate, and he himself will justly be hailed as the providential Saint of our age."

"In the second of his distinguished accomplishments," continued the Pope, "Pius X is revealed as the indomitable champion of the Church and the providential Saint of our times. In sometimes dramatic circumstances, this accomplishment resembled the struggle of a giant in defense of a priceless treasure: the internal unity of the Church in her innermost foundation: the Faith. ..... Uniquely concerned that the inheritance of God be preserved intact for the flock confided to his care, the great Pontiff knew no weakness when dealing with persons of dignity or authority; nor did he manifest vacillation when confronted with attractive but false doctrines within or without the Church; nor did he betray fear lest he bring upon himself personal affronts and unjust interpretations of his pure intentions.

"He had a clear conviction that he was fighting for the holiest cause of God and souls. The words which the Lord addressed to the Apostle Peter are literally verified in him: "I have prayed for the that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strenthen thy brethren."

The Holy Father also paid tribute to all that the Saint had done

to foster a deeper appreciation and love for the Eucharist, terming this one of the bright lights of his pontificate. "In the profound vision which he had of the Church as a society," said the Pope, "Pius X recognized that it was the Blessed Eucharist which had the power to nourish its intimate life substantially and to raise it high above all other human societies. Only the Eucharist, in which God gives Himself to man, is apt to lay the foundations of a social life worthy of those who live it, cemented more by love than by authority, rich in activity, and aimed at the perfection of the individual; a life that is "hidden with Christ in God."

* * * *

THE UNITED STATES

The Sixteenth Annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies at Fordham

The annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies took place once more this year at Fordham University on April 2. On the following day, a celebration of the liturgy in the Syro-Maronite Rite at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York marked the closing of the Conference which is now in the seventeenth year of its existence.

To coincide with the Marian Year, the general theme of the Fordham Conference in April was *Ave Regina Coelorum.* At its first session held in Collins Auditorium on the University grounds, the principal speakers were: Fr. Joseph Ledit, S.J. of Montreal, editor of the Canadian review, *Relations,* and for many years a professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, and Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, National Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association and President of the Pontifical Mission *Pro Palestina.* Fr. Ledit spoke on the theme: *Regina circumdata varietate* — the Origin of the Liturgical Rites,—while Msgr. McMahon's paper was entitled: *Veni de Libano, Sponsa mea* — Our Lady and the Rites of our Day. In the course of his address, Msgr. McMahon called Mary the sure passage way for the religious unity of the world. "Along the narrow but solid way," he said, "East and West, dissidents and Catholics, will yet converge on the deepened groove of religious unity and lasting peace."

His Excellency, Edward V. Dargin, Auxiliary Bishop and Vicar General of the Archdiocese of New York, presided at the sessions of the Fordham Conference. The President of the University, Fr. Lawrence J. McGinley, S.J. was present to greet those attending, while Brother Augustine Philip, F.S.C., President of Manhattan College led the discussion. It is estimated that 1,500 persons attended the sessions.

On the morning of April 3, the Conference sponsored a solemn concelebration of the Liturgy of St. James in the Syro-Maronite Rite, after which special prayers were offered in honor of the Mother of God. The principal concelebrant of the liturgy was the Most Rever-

end Chor Bishop Mansour Stephen, pastor of the Church of Our Lady of Lebanon in Brooklyn. He was assisted by a number of Maronite priests from other cities in the United States, while the singing in Syriac and Arabic was performed by the choir from the Chor Bishop's own church. A large congregation of some 4000 people was present in St. Patrick's Cathedral for the concelebration.

The Syro-Maronite Rite is comparatively widespread in the United States at the present time, so that in practically every large city there is at least a small church for the members of this rite. Actually, there are forty-eight Syro-Maronite parishes to be found in the United States serving about 50,000 faithful.

Russian Center at Fordham Seeking New Objectives

When the Russian Center was founded at Fordham University in December 1951, its organizers sought to attain three principal objectives. The Center's spring report discloses that these are now being achieved, and newer ones envisioned. According to the report, the three-fold program now being accomplished includes:

1. To inform American Catholics soundly about Russia, its customs and people. Up to the present, three of the Center's priests have thoroughly discussed via radio and television the Russian way of life, while others have lectured on the subject throughout the United States and Canada.

2. To train American priests for the Russian apostolate. One American has joined as a Brother and several others have made application to enter the Russian College in Rome, which was erected in 1928 by Pope Pius XI to train priests for work among the Russian people.

3. To publish Catholic literature in Russian. The report discloses that three books, a 200 page volume on spiritual exercises, a description of the present state of religion in Soviet Russia by a recent escapee and a dictionary of Catholic and Orthodox terminology already have been published in the Russian language.

Plans have already been made for a modern child's catechism in Russian, and this is now in preparation. Other books which are expected to appear soon include two in honor of the Marian Year, and a 300 page study of modern theology written by a priest long-experienced with problems encountered by the Orthodox. It is hoped that this volume will bring many of its Russian readers closer to the Catholic Church.

The report of the Center maintains that the apparitions in Fatima were evidence of the solicitude the Blessed Virgin holds for Russia. Despite the latter's separation from the Catholic Church, the Mother of God is held in great devotion by the Russian people, who have more than 300 feasts in her honor on their calendar and who keep an icon of her in a place of honor in their homes.

The report stresses, finally, that the Russian Center co-operates

with, but is distinct from the Institute of Russian Studies at Fordham University. The Center is instead a community of Russian Rite priests which was formed at the time China fell to the Communists. (NC)

Latest Catholic Statistics

The Catholic Church in the United States has grown to 31,648,424 members, an increase of 1,223,409 in the past year. These figures, which include the totals for Hawaii and Alaska, were published in the Official Catholic Directory for 1954 recently issued by the firm of P.J. Kenedy and Sons.

The new total represents a ten year gain of 8,228,723 over the 23,419,701 Catholics reported in 1944. In that length of time there have been 1,097,771 converts to the Church. The largest archdioceses in the country are: Chicago with 1,815,976, Boston with 1,426,319, and New York with 1,361,170; Philadelphia, Newark, and Detroit come next in order, each exceeding more than 1,000,000.

Two Lutheran Ministers Become Catholics

Two former Lutheran ministers were in a class of eleven converts received into the Church in St. Louis by Monsignor Martin B. Hellriegel, a prominent figure in the Liturgical Movement in the United States. The two ministers who were received with members of their families are Ernest Beck and Irving Arkin, both of whom held Lutheran pastorates in the East before going to St. Louis.

Among the reasons they gave for becoming Catholics were the modern Liturgical Movement, the Church's stand against racial segregation, and its refusal to compromise its position on the virtue of charity. They said that their conversion was a gradual process extending over a period of "years in which the grace of God worked slowly but surely in our souls:"

Both declared that Pope Pius XII had exerted a strong appeal upon them, and that "his personal charm and commanding position in a chaotic world led to the inescapable conclusion that he was the true Shepherd of the true Flock."

The objectives and achievements of the liturgical apostolate were also cited as holding an attraction for them. One of them is quoted as saying: "We learned to know and live the Church's teaching and her spirit through her liturgy . . . which we recognized as the living expression of the dynamic tradition given by Christ to His Apostles." (NC)

The New York Times Survey on World Religions

"Man's faith does not, on the whole, appear to have suffered any crippling blow in the last two decades as a result of the horrors of war, the discoveries of science, the encroachments of materialism, or the political and ideological conflicts of the current era." This is the principal conclusion derived from a survey of religious trends in

many parts of the world made by correspondents of the *New York Times*. In the United States, for example, leaders of all three of the major faiths — Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism — report a definite progress "in a religious climate that has never been more favorable." While no extraordinary religious revival is visualized, there is general agreement that there has been a very noticeable return to the principles of religion.

Some of the salient points of the survey are the following:

1. The observance of religion and the search for its spiritual comfort have been marked in almost every country that suffered severely from the disasters of war.

2. There is, in many countries, a marked trend toward reform in religion although basic faith remains strong. This is as true in Moslem Turkey or Jewish Israel as in largely Hindu India or Protestant England.

3. In Communist countries religion has been by no means stamped out. Even in Iron Curtain Poland, the Catholic Church remains strong and well attended. Censored dispatches from the Soviet Union indicate that, despite the official disapproval of religion, ideologically speaking, there are enough faithful Orthodox believers to contribute to the restoration of many damaged churches. In most countries where Communism poses a threat to national existence, religion seems to have gained both vigor and numbers of recruits.

* * * *

FRANCE

Rouen Cathedral Re-opened to the Public

The nave of the great Cathedral of Rouen, severely damaged by bombs during the war has been re-opened to the public after nine years of reconstruction work. A good deal of the latter still remains to be done, but it is hoped that all will be completed by May 1956 when the 500th anniversary of the retrial in Rouen of St. Joan of Arc will be commemorated.

During the re-opening ceremony, Archbishop Joseph Martin of Rouen, blessed a new fifty-bell carillon, Europe's largest. This was installed before Easter in the famous "Butter Tower" which is widely considered the world's most beautiful example of Gothic Architecture.

The Cathedral, built between 1201 and 1530, is one of of the most famous and most beautiful in France. Its towers are the highest of any other French church. (NC)

Plenary Assembly of the French Hierarchy

The Archbishops and Bishops of France met for a plenary session for the first time in many years on April 28, and at the close of the assembly issued a doctrinal statement under the general title: "The Church in the Modern World Confronting New Civilizations." In their declaration the French bishops evaluated both the progress and the deficiencies of the present day world and laid down concrete norms

to serve as a guide for Catholics in coping with the modern world situation.

The bishops were quite forthright in affirming the independence of the Church and her redemptive role in human affairs. "The Church," read their statement, "declares that no political or economic regime, no civilization, is capable of itself of providing all men with everything that is necessary if they are to live normally according to all the requirements of rational human nature — the more so because men cannot find, outside the Church, the fulfilment of their supernatural vocation, nor live their Christian life to the full. Whatever may be the external successes of modern civilizations established outside the Church, it must be stated that they cannot be authentic human civilizations, unless they are redeemed by the Church. The spiritual attainment of civilization must not be confused with its material success."

The declaration of the French hierarchy then went on to repudiate the secularist state without God, atheistic humanism, and Marxist materialism, giving the Christian principles for its stand. The bishops showed how these conceptions were a definite challenge to the Christian way of life and called upon Catholics to confront them by a renewal of a genuine missionary spirit both within and without their own communities.

"In the modern world," concludes the statement. and in the face of the civilizations of tomorrow, the Church affirms her hopes, without being unaware of the obstacles which confront her. She relies on the divine promises of her Founder. She has confidence in the gospel of salvation which He brought to the world and which He entrusted to her.

"She asks her children to keep themselves free from morbid and helpless anxiety as well as from culpable indifference. She reminds them that it is her destiny to carry out her mission through the succession of human civilizations, all of which have need of the Redemption.

"She will never cease to bring her message of love and salvation to those who have hitherto shut her out from their hearts. Her prayer envelops them and smooths their path towards God."

French Social Week

One of the outstanding institutions of modern French Catholicism will mark its fiftieth anniversary this July when the French Social Week meets at Rennes to discuss its 1954 topic, the Crisis of Power and the Crisis of Citizenship.

The first of these annual meetings of Catholic scholars to discuss world problems from the viewpoint of Church doctrine was held in Lyons in 1904. Since then the idea has spread throughout the world, and today seventeen countries hold national social weeks.

During their half century of existence, the French Social Weeks

have undertaken to examine a wide variety of problems social economic, political, agricultural, and many others. They have sought to explain and apply the social teachings of the Popes, who in turn have given the Social Weeks their special interest and approval. Pius XI commended them in his famous encyclical letter *Quadragesimo Anno,* and the present Holy Father sends them a special message each year.

The Social Weeks were founded by M. Adeodat Boissar, a law professor, and a newspaperman, Marius Gonin, whose beatification cause has been opened in Rome. (NC)

* * * *

ENGLAND

250 Anglican Sermons by Newman Discovered

A collection of 250 forgotten sermons preached by Cardinal Newman in his earlier days as an Anglican clergyman have been unearthed and may be published in book form. The manuscripts have lain since his death sixty-four years ago in the tin boxes in which he himself placed them in his room at the Birmingham headquarters of the Oratorian Fathers.

The existence of these sermons came to light through the efforts of the Benedictine monks at Weingarten Abbey, West Germany, who are at work translating the eight volumes of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* These include another 280 sermons he delivered as an Anglican minister before playing his great part in spreading the return of Catholicism to Great Britain in the last century. In the course of their investigations ,the German Benedictines contacted the Birmingham Oratory which the Cardinal founded and where he spent his later life. There Fr. Henry Tristram, guardian of the Cardinal's personal treasures, revealed to them the presence of the unpublished sermons.

Permission was at once sought to incorporate them in the German work, but the Oratorian Fathers feel that the sermons should be published in English before being translated into German. They are now looking for a publisher who will undertake such an interesting enterprise.

Cardinal Newman wrote out and kept most of the sermons he preached as an Anglican but gave up the practice generally after entering the Church. His Catholic sermons that do exist were taken down in shorthand by others. (NC)

Church of England Survey on Communist Persecution

An interesting survey entitled *The Churches of Europe under Communist Governments* was presented by the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations to the February Session of the Church Assembly of this year. It is a review of the way in which the Communist governments have systematically tried to suppress Christian Churches or to make of them no more than instruments of party propaganda.

There is a common method in all cases—eliminate the leaders; create and utilize a group of 'patriot' priests to cause division; abolish Christian teaching in schools and the Christian press. The survey assesses the present religious situation in Russia; gives the history of the destruction of the Catholic Churches of oriental rite, of the Catholic Church of Latin rite in Czechoslovakia, and of the position of the Protestant Churches in Eastern Germany.

The tone throughout is moderate and sympathetic and, except for a criticism here and there, wholly acceptable. The title, however, of the survey is somewhat misleading, even for a pamphlet, for no mention is made of the Catholics of Bulgaria, of both Latin and oriental rite; and hardly a word is devoted to Hungary and Poland where a vigorous persecution of the Latins has been carried on for some considerable time. The last paragraph of the editor's explanatory note deserves the utmost publicity, which we hope it will get through the wide diffusion of this pamphlet: "Conditions in Communist countries vary, but the Communist objectives remain constant, namely to undermine and destroy the Christian faith and the Christian Church in the most effective possible way."

* * * *

GERMANY

Papal Letter Calls Red Persecution probably the most Dangerous Ever

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, considers the persecution of the Church under Communism "probably the most dangerous" ever inflicted upon her. The Pope made this statement in a letter to the German bishops in acknowledgment of greetings which they had sent him for the new year. Excerpts from the papal letter were just recently made public.

"Within the Bolshevist—communist sphere of power," wrote the Pope, "the almost superhuman and cunning exploitation of technical and legal means at the disposal of state despotism if it wants to destroy the Church makes her persecution, in all probability, the most dangerous she has ever faced."

Twelfth Centenary of the Martyrdom of St. Boniface

Approximately 100,000 visitors, including very many bishops from all of the west European countries, attended sixteen days of festivities at Fulda—from May 29 to June 13—marking the 1200th anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans.

The celebrations reached their climax in June 13, when Archbishop Aloysius J. Muench, Nuncio to Germany, celebrated the Pontifical Mass in the square before Fulda Cathedral where St. Boniface lies buried. Preaching the sermon on this important occasion was His Eminence, Josef Cardinal Wendel, the Archbishop of Munich and Freising. The afternoon of the closing day also saw a great procession through the city of Fulda with the relics of the Saint, at the termination of which

Solemn Benediction was imparted by Cardinal Frings, the Archbishop of Cologne.

Similar demonstrations in honor of St. Boniface were planned also in Holland, where the Saint was martyred, and in England, the land of his birth. In the latter country, special celebrations were scheduled at Buckfast and at Plymouth, which is but a few miles from Credition, Devonshire where the Apostle of the Germans was born in 680. At Plymouth arrangements were being made for a great pageant in honor of the Saint to be attended by many members of the British Hierarchy, the two German Cardinals, and by many pilgrims from the different countries of Europe. The ceremonies would then be brought to a close by an evening Pontifical Mass celebrated in the open by His Eminence, Cardinal Wendel.

In Rome, meantime, Pope Pius issued a new encyclical letter to commemorate the death of St. Boniface. Addressed in particular to the Bishops of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, the letter brings into special relief the great Benedictine's intense loyalty to the Holy See and the heroism of his mission. (NC)

German Catholics Preparing for 1954 Katholikentag

The city of Fulda, rich in tradition for the Church in Germany, will be the setting for the 67th *Katholikentag* (German National Catholic Convention) from August 30 to September 5. It will have as its general theme, "You shall bear witness to Me." Many thousands are expected from all over West Germany and a large number also from East Germany.

Auxiliary Bishop Franz Hengsbach of Paderborn, who is the episcopal representative on the German Catholic Central Committee, recently declared in a radio address that the purpose of the forthcoming *Katholikentag* went far beyond that of paying honor to St. Boniface in this centenary year.

"We want to examine our consciences as to how we have preserved what the Saint gave us, the Church of Christ in Germany," the Bishop said. "What have you done to the Church of Christ? and, What have you done to the union of faith and life? These are the two questions which St. Boniface asks us today. (NC)

Salzburg Academic Weeks to Commemorate St Augustine

The annual Salzburg "Academic Weeks" *(Hochschulwochen)* which from their foundation in 1931 have contributed much to the development of Catholic thought, will be held this year from August 8 to the 22nd.

A number of prominent scholars will give lectures and take part in the discussion of various study groups meeting together for the Academic Weeks. To commemorate the 1,600th birthday of St. Augustine, the theme of the conference this year will be: Augustine in Time and above Time.

The sessions in Salzburg this summer will draw Catholic scholars

from the universities of Bonn, Freiburg, Berlin, Innsbruck, Lucerne, Vienna and Munich. (NC)

Mass Being Said in 700 Protestant Churches in East Germany

Because of the lack of Catholic churches, Mass is at present being offered in about 700 Protestant churches throughout the eastern part of the Berlin diocese. This was revealed to a group of French correspondents visiting Berlin by Fr. Erich Klausener, editor of the *Petrusblatt,* the Berlin diocesan weekly.

This situation finds its explanation in the tremendous population shifts that followed the end of World War II. Tens of thousands of Catholics, expelled from Silesia and the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia, found shelter in towns and villages of eastern Germany that for centuries had been almost wholly Protestant.

Penniless themselves and settled in a country largely destroyed and impoverished by war, these refugees had no means to build their own churches. There have been many reports describing how their Protestant neighbors took pity on them and invited them to use existing Protestant churches for Catholic services until other arrangements could be made.

During the war and in the first years after it, similar cases have been reported from West Germany. Many Protestant churches offered hospitality to Catholics whose churches had been destroyed by bombs. Catholic prelates have voiced their gratitude for such acts of charity. (NC)

* * * *

SWITZERLAND

Christian Optimism Counselled by Pope to Swiss Catholics

A high light of the Swiss *Katholikentag* for 1954 which took place in Fribourg in May and which attracted some 30,000 persons, was a special broadcast from the Holy Father during which he spoke to Swiss Catholics in three languages: German, French, and Italian. His message consisted of three principal points: trust in God and the Blessed Virgin in a spirit of Christian optimism, the giving of good example by fervent Catholic living, and the imitation of the early Christians in fighting today's materialism.

Speaking in French, the Pope said: "The history of early Christianity is applicable to today's circumstances. The early Christians were confronted with a pagan and materialistic civilization which ruled unchallenged. They attacked it and finally conquered, thanks to their unyielding tenacity and through great sacrifices. Imitate them."

Using the medium of Italian, the Holy Father counselled that the true Christian believes in providence and is unswayed by the dangers looming from the new accomplishments of science. Therefore, he added, in a spirit of Christian optimism we all should "turn our gaze, with filial trust to Mary, Mother of Mercy, under whose powerful and universal protection we place our entire future."

In the German part of his address, the Pope reminded the Catholics of Switzerland of "the mission that confronts you; to live a life dedicated to the faith which may serve as an example to the people." He added that his paternal interest goes out to those in particular who are in public life. He urged them to "give your brothers and sisters an example of pure love for the Church."

Speaking further in German, the Holy Father addressed a special reminder to intellectuals. He asked them to remember in their scientific work that all reasoned judgments end in an absolute and unconditioned truth. To consider all knowledge, even that concerning the highest laws of reason and existence, as merely relative, is contrary to nature and to Christianity, he said, and then added:

"Those higher laws necessarily lead to God and, vice versa, the profession of a personal God comprises within itself the acceptance of absolute truth. Far from hindering research, absolute truth forms its indispensable basis and strongest support against error."

In conclusion, His Holiness entrusted the whole world to the protection of the Mother of God. He invoked the help of Mary that peoples may practice those Christian virtues that always render nations happy, and that those who have left their Father's house may find the way to return to it. (NC)

BULGARIA

New Government Committee on Religious Affairs

"Advice" on religious questions will be available in the future for Bulgarian Catholics and members of the Orthodox Church from a new committee on religious matters set up by the Red-controlled Bulgarian Government. The committee's formation was announced in *Zemedelsko Zname* (Peasant Standard) a Communist newspaper published in Sofia. According to that journal, the committee's task will be to bring about a "close" co-operation between the Churches and the Government.

Actually, Bulgaria's 57,000 Catholics are ruthlessly persecuted and the Bulgarian Orthodox Church has been reduced to a tool of the state. Two of the three Catholic Bishops of the country are in prison, and all Catholic schools and institutions have been closed. Last year it was reported that only ten priests in the entire nation remained free. Traditionally Bulgaria has had a Bureau of Religious Affairs as a part of the Foreign Affairs Ministry. The new committee, however, will function as the official representative of the central committee of the Communist Party in Bulgaria.

It is thought that the new committee will be charged with the training of "patriotic priests" and with closely watching all religious activities. (NC)

EGYPT

Franciscan Study Center Opened in Cairo

A Catholic study center has been inaugurated in the Eyptian capital

for the purpose of building a bridge between Christian and Islamic cultures in the Middle East.

It is called the "Center of Oriental Studies of the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land." It was founded by Fr. Martiniano Roncaglia, a Franciscan who obtained his degree at the Sorbonne in Paris.

A letter of congratulations on the opening of the Center was sent by His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation fo the Eastern Church. (NC)

MEXICO

Anti-religious Restrictions Still in Force

The Catholic Church and religion generally are still subject to severe restrictions under the Mexican Constitution of 1917. The law of that year made civil marriages compulsory, banned private schools, and made religious instruction in state schools illegal. It further denied the right of churches to own or administer property and forbade public "religious manifestations of any kind."

Recent developments involved a Supreme Court ruling reaffirming the denial of property ownership rights to any church and the Government's failure to permit the showing of a new Catholic film, presumably on the grounds that it would constitute a public "religious manifestation."

The decision of the Supreme Court was handed down in a case in which two Protestant sects were at issue over the use of a worship center in the Capital. The Court ruled that the premises were the property of the State but could be used jointly by the two groups. Article 130 of the Charter states that the law does not grant legal character to any "religious groups known as churches." The same law applies to bishops' residences, rectories, seminaries, convents, and any type of church-conducted institution, as well as to churches proper. (NC)

SOUTH KOREA

2000 Converts Baptized during Holy Saturday Rites

The number of converts baptized in South Korea on Holy Saturday of the first peaceful Easter the country has known in four years was believed to total close to 2000. Fifty converts alone were baptized in Seoul's Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception.

According to the latest available statistics for South Korea, there were 10,057 conversions to the Church there last year, while the number of those under instruction during that time was reported as being 14,502. (NC)

BURMA

First Native Burmese Bishop

Burma's 150,000 Catholics have enthusiastically received the news

of the appointment of their first native bishop by the Holy See. He is Fr. John Joseph, who has distinguished himself in the field of Catholic Action and in various charitable and social activities.. The Holy Father has named him Titular Bishop of Lete and auxiliary to Bishop Albert Faliere, French-born Vicar Apostolic of Mandalay.

The majority of Burma's more than 18,000,000 people are Buddhists. The country's 1947 constitution gives Buddhism a special place, but all other religious groups there are given full freedom. (NC)

* * * *

THE CHALDEAN CHURCH

Appointment of Three New Prelates

According to a recent announcement in Rome, the Holy Father has made public the appointment of three Chaldean Rite prelates, two archbishops and bishop.

Fr. Ephrem Gogue has been named Archbishop of Kerkuk in Iraq; Fr. Joseph Gogue has been designated Archbishop for the patriarchal vicariate of Bassorah (Basra) in Iraq; and Fr. Souleiman Sayegh has been named Titular Bishop of Paleopolis in Asia and appointed as auxiliary to Patriarch Joseph VII Ghanima of Babylon of the Chaldeans. (NC)

BOOK REVIEWS

R. V. SELLERS: *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, S.P.C.K. 1953) 361 pages. Price 37 shills. 6d.

This is an eminently satisfying book, sober, scholarly, thorough. Its sub-title: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey, indicates its general scope.

In Part I, Section I, the author deals with the historical background of the Council, tracing the course of events after the Council of Ephesus which had roused the antagonism of Alexandria by its allotting to the "New Rome" precedence over more ancient Sees. Dioscorus, as the successor of Cyril and champion of Alexandria's claims, united zeal for orthodoxy with a determination to humble a rival, and by careful manoeuvring and the judicious winning of friends in high places gained a shortlived triumph at the Robber Council, and then an unexpected change of emperor heralded his eclipse. This section covers the history till the end of the Council of Chalcedon thoroughly but without an overwhelming massing of detail that would have obscured rather than clarified the general picture.

Section II contains the doctrinal background in three chapters — the Christological thought of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of the West — under two aspects, Christological confession and Christological enquiry, i.e. the expression of the faith and the explanation and defence of that faith in face of error. It is the contention of the author, supported by abundant quotations, that all three held firmly to the same faith, that in Jesus Christ there was one Person with two distinct natures, even though each had a certain tone of thought peculiar to itself. Alexandrian thought saw the aim of the Incarnation to be the divinisation of man: Antioch, set in a Jewish milieu, was more tied to soteriological aspects: and the West, inheritor of the Roman concept of law, was also soteriologically inclined, but in a more juridical sense. But not all were equally blessed with clear exponents of their faith. Cyril was outstanding, and much of the controversy that followed Ephesus and Chalcedon was due to the inability of others to appreciate his full theology. Even Dioscorus was orthodox, but clung to a phrase and a name too much and lost sight of the substance.

The definition of Chalcedon (Part II), far from being "the bankruptcy of Greek Patristic Theology" was a positive exposition of the faith that was common to Alexandria, Antioch, and the West — the point where the three roads met. It reflected the double process the author had noted in his examination of the background of the Council — Christological confession and enquiry. Each of the three streams of theological thought contributed to the general result, and the author tries to determine the probable sources of the different phrases. It is a positive definition, not merely a negative rebuttal of heresies, though the Nestorian and the Eutychian errors are formally denied, wherein the positive element predominates with its affirmations of

the sameness of the Person, the duality of the natures, and all the other clauses, each adding or underlining a fine point (and even the four famous adverbs) are positive. As such, this definition takes its place alongside of those of Nicaea and Constantinople, and the four Councils became the standard of orthodoxy.

But alas, not for all. For some the words of Cyril were more vital than his thought. His phrase: "One incarnate nature after the union," was open to easy misunderstanding, unless 'incarnate' was given as much stress as 'nature' and the whole interpreted as 'person.' Chalcedon for the Monophysites was the grand betrayal, and they would not be persuaded (politics and local rivalries played their part also in all this) that Chalcedon and Cyril both taught the same faith and in almost the same words. As was to be expected, Egypt was the great stronghold of the Monophysites, in a misplaced loyalty to its great hero and a continued opposition to Constantinople. Various attempts were made to reconcile Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, culminating in the fifth Council, and of these the author gives the general lines.

This is a most satisfying book not only for the treatment of its main theme, but also for the many notes that sum up excellently some incident, writer, or literary controversy and put at the reader's disposal the fruits of long study. Its production too is excellent. In the footnotes there is an occasional misprint of a Greek accent, and on p. 180 n. 9 'prosopon' should be 'prosopou.'

J. GILL, S.J.

SAINT PAUL'S MISSION TO GREECE. Nineteenth Centenary. *A Volume of Commemoration compiled by H. S. Alivasatos, D.D., General Secretary to the Saint Paul Festival Committee.* Athens: no price quoted. 645 pp.

A pilgrimage commemorating the nineteenth centenary of the arrival of Saint Paul the Apostle in Europe, conducted under the auspices of a committee headed by His Grace the Archbishop of Athens and All Greece, Spyridon, took place from June 15 to 30, 1951. To it were invited representatives of all the separated Byzantine Churches and many of the other Christian bodies. Among the actual participants were delegations from the principal Byzantine groups (with the notable exception of the Patriarchates of Moscow and Roumania), from the Coptic Churches in Egypt and Ethiopia, the Anglican Establishment, and various reformed groups in Europe, the United States, and New Zealand. Three Catholic priests accompanied the pilgrimage in a purely private capacity. The present volume is a record of the arrangements made for the pilgrimage, the lectures and sermons that took place during its course, publicity given to it in learned and popular journals, and a complete list of the participants.

The pilgrimage set out from Athens and followed the footsteps of Saint Paul at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Nicopolis. From thence it continued to Crete and Rhodes, and back to Athens by way

of Cenchrea and Corinth. The Liturgy and Vespers of the Byzantine Church were sung at the various centers hallowed by the presence of the Apostle. It would appear that any official religious services were strictly in conformity with Orthodox discipline and tradition, though opportunities were provided for the private celebration of other rites. Among the lecturers were the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh, Lutheran and Calvinist clergymen from the Continent, and Fr. Edouard Beauduin. The theme of each and every conference centered on Saint Paul.

A number of items in this volume will be of particular interest to Catholics. First, there is the exchange of letters between the Committee in charge of the Commemoration and the Holy See (pp. 85-87). In response to the invitation of the Committee addressed to the Holy Father, Monsignor Montini reports the deep joy of His Holiness in learning of the plans for the solemn commemoration and his regret at the necessity of declining the invitation to send a representation. To cite the reasons given by the Holy See for its refusal, as "being of this world" as did Professor Ionnides (quoted by Fr. Dumont, p. 500) in his address of welcome to the delegates at Salonica is hardly in keeping with the high tone of the correspondence. The reference to the reply of Dr. Alivisatos as *"fort pertinent"* as quoted from the article by H. Clavier (p. 504) must be judged in the light of the correspondence. The General Secretary expressed his regret that the Catholic Church (and was delicate enough not to qualify this title) would not have an official representation and his happiness that at least there was official communication on the subject expressive of the good-will of the Holy Father in regard to the commemoration. His distinction in regard to the origin of the invitation being the Church of Greece and not the Hellenic State does not alter the fact that embarrassment would ensue were the Catholic Church to send and official delegation to one of the few nations where a purely ecclesiastical representative of the Holy See was not allowed to dwell. A lengthy citation from the "Messager d'Athènes" (pp. 569-70) tending to equate the political aspirations of the Vatican and the Church of Moscow is unfortunate, though this was a journalistic effort in no way officially connected with the Committee.

Another phrase in Monsignor Montini's letter, "et abstraction faite d'autres considérations," seems to have been neglected by the commentators cited. One example of an attitude that would put any Catholic, even an observer, in a difficult position is illustrated in the address of G. I. Konidaris (pp. 368-389). The original inclusion of Illyricum in the Roman patriarchate is termed an "irregularity" (p. 376) which "was ended by Leo III in 733 A.D. when the opposition of East and West over the question of icons afforded a favourable opportunity." Later on (p. 386) a footnote disposes of the Church of Rome as being "transformed into a socio-political organisation." In fairness, however, one must agree that most of the lecturers strove

always to avoid offense, no easy task when the foreign delegates embraced men of all shades of opinion, from Copts to Quakers.

In addition to inviting the "heads of Churches" the Committee also wrote to theological faculties requesting the attendance of representatives, and to individual theologians of note. Included in the responses from Catholics are letters from the Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, the Catholic Theological Faculty of the Universities of Lyons and Strasbourg, the Pontifical University of Rio de Janeiro, the Faculty of Theology at Louvain, Fr. C. J. Dumont of "Istina" and Dom Pierre Dumont of "L'Oeuvre d'Orient" (both of whom attended the pilgrimage). Evaluations of the Pilgrimage are given by Don Pierre Dumont in a reprint from *Irenicon* (pp. 488-492) and Fr. C. J. Dumont in a citation from *Istina* (pp. 495-502).

This monumental volume is truly "ecumenical" in its format. The Greek text of official documents, sermons, and reports is often accompanied by translation in English. Texts originally written in English, French, German, or Italian are retained in these languages. There are pro-illustrations of the personalities attending the pilgrimage and the ceremonies held at the various stops, as well as informal photographs of those attending conferences and discussions. The volume contains a wealth of information for all interested in the inspiring figure of the Apostle of the Gentiles. It should serve as a permanent record of the real desire on the part of the Committee who planned the Pilgrimage that all might have an opportunity to pay homage to Saint Paul on the 19th centenary of his arrival in Europe.

DUNSTAN DONOVAN, S.A.

UT SINT UNUM - *An Appeal to Apostles of Unity:* Fr. Simon Arsenault of the Institut des Frères de S. Vincent de Paul. (Quebec, Editions Caritas, 1953) 190 pages.

On every side appeals have been made for a unity of minds and hearts — appeals from God, appeals of personal judgment, appeals from the Holy Father and appeals from Society. During the silence of a year's retirement and recollection, the author of this book has grasped these entreaties which "reach out over a troubled world" and he redirects them to us with a profound apostolic *elan* in order that they might penetrate the very marrow of our souls and give rise to an extensive crusade for unity.

A contemplative work, and one of deep spirituality, destined first of all for consecrated souls, this gratifying volume is but a chapter of a more extensive endeavor dedicated to Christian unity, a subject for which Fr. Arsenault tells us he has a special preoccupation (p. 99). Readers will derive a good deal from meditating on the various points discussed, for it is more a book to be used for prayer than a treatise on the subject of ecumenism.

DANIEL STIERNON, A.A.

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavors to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: "This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life."

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavors to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.